

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00425 01 OF 16 121345Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10  
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05  
SP-02 SS-15 ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /094 W  
-----106756 121353Z /50

P R 121213Z JUL 78  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3072  
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 16 MBFR VIENNA 0425

E.O. 11652: GDS  
TAGS: PARM NATO MBFR  
SUBJ: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES  
OF JULY 11, 1978

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: IN THE JULY 11, 1978 INFORMAL SESSION OF THE VIENNA TALKS, THE ALLIES WERE REPRESENTED BY THE NETHERLANDS REP, UK REP AND US DEPREP, AND THE EAST BY SOVIET REPS TARASOV AND SHUSTOV, GDR REP OESER, AND POLISH REP STRULAK. MILITARY ADVISORS WERE ALSO PRESENT.

2. THE SESSION WAS AGAIN A LENGTHY ONE. WESTERN REPS SHOWED HOW THE WEST HAD TAKEN THE GEOGRAPHIC FACTOR INTO ACCOUNT IN THE WESTERN POSITION, ANSWERED AN EASTERN QUESTION ON THE WESTERN POSITION REGARDING ARMAMENT REDUCTIONS BY WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN THE US, ASKED FURTHER QUESTIONS ON THE EAST'S JUNE 8 PROPOSALS, ANSWERED EASTERN QUESTIONS ON WESTERN DATA, AND COMMENTED ON THE EASTERN DATA. EASTERN REPS ANSWERED WESTERN QUESTIONS ON EASTERN DATA, COMMENTED ON THE  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00425 01 OF 16 121345Z

WEST'S VIEWS CONCERNING THE GEOGRAPHIC FACTOR, INDICATED WILLINGNESS TO DISCUSS THE TOPIC OF INCLUSIONS OR EXCLUSIONS AS IT CONCERNED WESTERN DATA ON PACT FORCES, AND ASKED A LONG SERIES OF FURTHER QUESTIONS MAINLY ABOUT WESTERN DATA ON EASTERN FORCES.

3. POLISH REP ANSWERED JUNE 20 WESTERN QUESTION ON POLISH UNITS

OF TERRITORIAL DEFENSE TO THE EFFECT THAT THERE WERE ENGINEER TROOPS IN REGULAR POLISH FORCES, BUT THAT THE ONLY RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION, OR ENGINEERING CONSTRUCTION UNITS IN POLAND WERE IN THE UNITS OF TERRITORIAL DEFENSE. ALTHOUGH PRODDER BY WESTERN REPS, POLISH REP DECLINED TO ANSWER ON TECHNICAL GROUNDS TWO WESTERN QUESTIONS ON EASTERN DATA FROM THE JULY 4 SESSION.

3A. NETHERLANDS REP SUMMARIZED HOW THE WESTERN POSITION TOOK ACCOUNT OF GEOGRAPHY IN FRAMING OBLIGATIONS PROPOSED FOR BOTH SIDES. NETHERLANDS REP EXPLAINED EFFECTS OF GEOGRAPHY AS REGARDS GENUINE PARITY AS OBJECTIVE. HE DID SAME FOR COLLECTIVE MANPOWER CEILINGS AND THE WESTERN OPPOSITION TO ARMAMENT REDUCTIONS BY WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN THE US AND POINTED OUT THAT THE EASTERN APPROACH WOULD CREATE A SITUATION WHERE THE LARGEST EASTERN POWER WAS THE ONLY CONTINENTAL EUROPEAN DIRECT PARTICIPANT WHOSE TOTAL MILITARY MANPOWER, ARMAMENTS AND FORCE STRUCTURE WAS NOT LIMITED IN ANY WAY UNDER AN AGREEMENT.

4. TARASOV CLAIMED THE WEST HAD NOT DEMONSTRATED HOW THE WESTERN PROGRAM TOOK GEOGRAPHY INTO ACCOUNT AND CHALLENGED WESTERN REPS TO SHOW SPECIFICALLY HOW GEOGRAPHY SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN THE PROVISIONS OF AN AGREEMENT.

5. TARASOV ANSWERED WESTERN QUESTION OF JULY 4 AS TO WHY EASTERN AUTHORITIES, IF THEY CONSIDERED AT THE OUTSET OF THE NEGOTIATIONS THAT THE TOTAL MANPOWER STRENGTH OF BOTH SIDES  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00425 01 OF 16 121345Z

WAS APPROXIMATELY EQUAL, HAD WAITED UNTIL JUNE 1978 TO ACCEPT PARITY IN MILITARY MANPOWER, STATING IN SUBSTANCE THAT THE EAST HAD CONSIDERED EQUAL PERCENTAGE REDUCTIONS MORE EQUITABLE THAN THE COMMON CEILING. TARASOV REPLIED TO THE WESTERN QUESTION WHY EASTERN AUTHORITIES, IF THEY BELIEVED THAT THERE WAS MANPOWER PARITY IN THE AREA AT THE OUTSET OF THE TALKS HAD, IN THE SPRING OF 1976, INSTRUCTED EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES TO PRESS FOR DELETION OF EASTERN MILITARY PERSONEL WHOM THE EAST CLAIMED WERE PERFORMING FUNCTIONS SIMILAR TO THOSE PERFORMED BY CIVILIAN PERSONNEL IN THE WEST. TARASOV SAID IT WAS TRUE THAT CARRYING OUT THIS EASTERN SUGGESTION WOULD HAVE RESULTED IN A LOWER CEILING FOR THOSE EASTERN FORCES WHICH WOULD HAVE BEEN COUNTED,

BUT THE OTHER EASTERN MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO WOULD HAVE BEEN EXCLUDED WOULD REMAIN IN THE AREA AND THEIR NUMBER WOULD BRING THE COUNT TO ROUGH EQUALITY. WESTERN REPS POINTED OUT THAT IF EASTERN AUTHORITIES HAD CONSIDERED THAT THERE WAS EQUALITY IN MANPOWER IN THE AREA AT THE OUTSET OF THE TALKS, THEIR OPPOSITION TO THE COMMON CEILING AT THAT TIME WAS STILL DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND BECAUSE THERE WAS NO REAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EQUAL PERCENTAGE REDUCTIONS AND REDUCTION FROM GIVEN LEVELS OF FORCES TO A COMMON CEILING.

6. UK REP GAVE REASONS WHY WESTERN PARTICIPANTS OPPOSED  
REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS BY WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS  
OTHER THAN THE US. THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF GEOGRAPHY REQUIRED THAT  
WESTERN MILITARY PLANNERS TAKE INTO ACCOUNT NOT ONLY

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00425 02 OF 16 121332Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10  
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05  
SP-02 SS-15 ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /094 W  
-----106660 121354Z /50

P R 121213Z JUL 78  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3073  
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 16 MBFR VIENNA 0425

THOSE WARSAW PACT FORCES IN THE REDUCTION AREA BUT ALSO THOSE  
ACTIVE DUTY SOVIET FORCES IN THE WESTERN PORTION OF THE  
SOVIET UNION WHICH WOULD BECOME INVOLVED IN A POSSIBLE  
CONFLICT AT ITS OUTSET. THIS REQUIREMENT APPLIED NOT ONLY  
TO MILITARY MANPOWER BUT ALSO TO ARMAMENTS. THE EAST HAD  
NUMERICAL SUPERIORITY IN MOST MAJOR ARMAMENTS IN THE  
REDUCTION AREA. THE TOTAL NUMBERS OF MAJOR ARMAMENTS AT THE  
DISPOSAL OF WARSAW TREATY FORCES HAD INCREASED IN RECENT  
YEARS BOTH IN THE REDUCTION AREA AND IN THE WESTERN PART  
OF THE SOVIET UNION. FOR WESTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES  
TO ACCEPT REDUCTION OR LIMITATION OF THEIR ARMAMENTS IN  
THESE CIRCUMSTANCES WOULD CONTRACTUALIZE SUPERIORITIES  
IN THE AREA AND WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO WESTERN SECURITY.  
THEREFORE, THE WEST'S POSITION OF PRINCIPLED OPPOSITION  
TO ARMAMENT REDUCTIONS BY THE WESTERN EUROPEAN DIRECT  
PARTICIPANTS AND CANADA CONTINUED VALID AND WAS A MAJOR  
REASON WHY WESTERN PARTICIPANTS COULD NOT UNDERTAKE A  
COMMITMENT IN PHASE I TO REDUCE THEIR ARMAMENTS IN PHASE II.  
AT THE SAME TIME, WESTERN PARTICIPANTS ALSO STOOD BY THE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00425 02 OF 16 121332Z

PREVIOUSLY STATED VIEW THAT THE TOPIC OF ARMAMENT REDUCTION WAS NOT PRECLUDED FROM THE SUBJECT MATTER OF PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS IF EASTERN PARTICIPANTS WISHED TO RAISE IT AT THAT TIME. UK REP PROCEEDED TO ASK THREE QUESTIONS ON EASTERN PROPOSAL.

7. IN REPLY TO QUESTIONS, TARASOV SAID THE ISSUE OF WHAT TYPE OF RESIDUAL LIMITATIONS, NATIONAL OR COLLECTIVE, ON ARMAMENTS TO BE REDUCED BY WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN PHASE II WAS A TOPIC WHICH SHOULD BE NEGOTIATED IN THE SECOND PHASE. HE SAID THE 1,000 TANKS TO BE WITHDRAWN BY THE SOVIET UNION UNDER THE EAST'S JULY 8 PROPOSAL WOULD BE COMPOSED OF THE TANKS OF THE TWO COMPLETE DIVISIONS WHOSE WITHDRAWAL HAD BEEN PROPOSED, TOGETHER WITH THE TANKS OF THE TANK UNITS THE EAST HAD SPECIFIED.

8. GDR REP CLAIMED THAT ALTHOUGH EAST/WEST AGREEMENT HAD BEEN REACHED AT ONE POINT ON INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS, WESTERN REPS APPEARED TO BE QUESTIONING IT IN RECENT QUESTIONS, ESPECIALLY ON SOVIET, POLISH AND GDR FORCES. THE EAST WAS PREPARED TO EXCLUDE RESERVISTS, CIVILIAN PERSONNEL AND PERSONNEL OF OTHER ORGANIZATIONS WEARING UNIFORMS AND EQUIPPED WITH WEAPONS IF THE WEST FOR ITS PART WAS PREPARED TO AGREE TO THE EXCLUSION OF PERSONNEL LISTED BY THE EAST IN ITS STATEMENT IN THE INFORMAL SESSION OF 31 MAY 1977. BUT THIS WAS A PACKAGE DEAL: EAST WOULD ACCEPT WEST'S EXCLUSIONS ONLY IF WEST ACCEPTED EASTERN EXCLUSIONS. GDR REP ALSO SUGGESTED PARTICIPANTS COME BACK TO THE QUESTION OF DEFINITIONS IN A MORE DEFINITIVE WAY IN ORDER TO ESTABLISH EXCLUSIONS AND INCLUSIONS USED BY THE WEST IN ITS FIGURES ON WARSAW TREATY FORCES. GDR REP PROCEEDED TO ASK LENGTHY SERIES OF QUESTIONS ON EXCLUSIONS PREVIOUSLY ANSWERED BY WESTERN REPS IN 31 MAY SESSION. WESTERN REPS ANSWERED A NUMBER OF THESE QUESTIONS. DURING DISCUSSION OF THESE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00425 02 OF 16 121332Z

QUESTIONS, TARASOV INDICATED CONSIDERABLE SENSITIVITY TO POSSIBILITY THAT WEST WAS ATTEMPTING THROUGH THE USE OF LISTS B AND C TO DRAW THE EAST INTO A FURTHER DISAGGREGATION OF EASTERN DATA. END SUMMARY

9. POLISH REP WELCOMED PARTICIPANTS. HE SAID THAT, SINCE THE PRESENT SESSION WAS THE LAST OF THE ROUND BUT ONE, EASTERN REPS WISHED TO COMPLETE THE MUTUAL EXCHANGE OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS. FIRST, THE EAST WOULD LIKE TO ANSWER WESTERN QUESTIONS

FROM THE JULY 4 SESSION. THE EAST HAD ALREADY ANSWERED THE FIRST QUESTION RAISED BY THE WEST IN THAT SESSION.

10. POLISH REP SAID THE WEST'S SECOND QUESTION HAD RELATED TO GUARD UNITS AND SUBUNITS OF THE GDR. THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION WAS THAT THE MANPOWER OF THE GUARD UNITS AND SUBUNITS OF THE GDR WHICH WERE NOT SUBORDINATE TO MILITARY DISTRICTS HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN THE SECOND CATEGORY.

11. POLISH REP SAID THE WEST'S THIRD QUESTION HAD REFERRED TO THE EXCLUSION OF UNITS AND SUBUNITS. THE EAST'S ANSWER WAS THAT, IN ACCORDANCE WITH AN EARLIER UNDERSTANDING, THE MANPOWER OF UNITS AND SUBUNITS SUBORDINATE TO OTHER MINISTRIES AND DEPARTMENTS APART FROM DEFENSE MINISTRIES, OR WHICH WERE PERFORMING MISSIONS IN THE FIELD OF INTERNAL SECURITY, BORDER SECURITY, OR PROTECTION OF ENTERPRISES AND INSTITUTIONS, HAD BEEN EXCLUDED FROM THE FIGURES OF THE MANPOWER OF THE WARSAW TREATY COUNTRIES.

12. US DEPREP POINTED OUT THAT POLISH REP HAD NOT ANSWERED THE QUESTION ASKED WHICH WAS, WHETHER ANY ENGINEER, ENGINEERING CONSTRUCTION, RAILROAD CONSTRUCTION AND TRANSPORT UNITS AND SUBUNITS IN THE FORCES OF THE GDR, POLAND AND

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00425 03 OF 16 121341Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10  
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05  
SP-02 SS-15 ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /094 W  
-----106719 121355Z /50

P R 121213Z JUL 78  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3074  
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 16 MBFR VIENNA 0425

CZECHOSLOVAKIA HAD BEEN EXCLUDED FROM THE EAST'S FIGURES BECAUSE THEY WERE SUBORDINATE TO MINISTRIES OTHER THAN THE

MINISTRIES OF DEFENSE OR PERFORMED FUNCTIONS IN THE FIELD OF INTERNAL SECURITY, BORDER SECURITY OR PUBLIC WORKS? POLISH REP SAID THE EAST'S ANSWER WAS EXHAUSTIVE AND CONCERNED ALL UNITS AND SUBUNITS SUBORDINATE TO MINISTRIES OTHER THAN MINISTRIES OF DEFENSE OR PERFORMING MISSIONS IN THE FIELD OF INTERNAL SECURITY, BORDER SECURITY OR PUBLIC WORKS. US DEPREP SAID THIS ANSWER WAS NOT RESPONSIVE AND REPEATED THE QUESTION.

13. TARASOV SAID PARTICIPANTS HAD AGREED THAT THEY WERE EXCLUDING THOSE UNITS AND SUBUNITS WHICH WERE SUBORDINATE TO MINISTRIES OTHER THAN DEFENSE MINISTRIES OR WHICH WERE PERFORMING FUNCTIONS IN THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNAL SECURITY, BORDER GUARDS OR IN PUBLIC WORKS. THEREFORE, ALL UNITS AND SUBUNITS IRRESPECTIVE OF WHETHER THEY WERE ENGINEER, UNITS OR NOT OR TRANSPORT UNITS OR NOT, WERE EXCLUDED FROM THE EASTERN COUNT IF THEY WERE SUBORDINATE TO OTHER MINISTRIES ASIDE FROM  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00425 03 OF 16 121341Z

THE DEFENSE MINISTRIES OR IF THEY PERFORMED FUNCTIONS IN THE FIELD OF INTERNAL SECURITY, BORDER GUARDS OR PUBLIC WORKS. THIS WAS THE EAST'S ANSWER. THERE WAS NO NECESSITY FOR THE EAST TO ANALYZE THE QUESTION OF WHETHER THERE WERE ENGINEER, ENGINEER CONSTRUCTION UNITS OR SUBUNITS IN THE NAVY, SINCE PARTICIPANTS HAD EXCLUDED NAVAL PERSONNEL FROM THEIR COUNT ACCORDING TO THEIR MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING. THE PRESENT CASE WAS A SIMILAR ONE.

14. US DEPREP SAID THE WEST HAD INCLUDED CERTAIN ENGINEER, ENGINEER CONSTRUCTION, RAILROAD CONSTRUCTION AND TRANSPORT UNITS AND SUBUNITS OF THE THREE EASTERN COUNTRIES IN ITS OWN FIGURES FOR WARSAW TREATY FORCES. THE EAST MIGHT HAVE EXCLUDED THE SAME UNITS ON THE GROUNDS THAT THEY WERE WORKING FOR SOME OTHER MINISTRY. TARASOV SAID, IF THE WEST HAD INCLUDED IN ITS FIGURES ANY ENGINEER, ENGINEER CONSTRUCTION, RAILROAD CONSTRUCTION OR TRANSPORT UNITS SUBORDINATE TO OTHER THAN THE DEFENSE MINISTRIES OR PERFORMING FUNCTIONS IN THE FIELD OF INTERNAL SECURITY, BORDER GUARDS OR PUBLIC WORKS, THEN THE WEST WOULD HAVE DONE THIS ON AN UNJUSTIFIED BASIS AND SHOULD EXCLUDE THESE PERSONNEL FROM ITS FIGURES.

15. US DEPREP SAID THE WEST HAD NOT INCLUDED SUCH PERSONNEL IN ITS FIGURES WHERE IT WAS KNOWN THEY WERE SUBORDINATE TO OTHER MINISTRIES OR HAD OTHER FUNCTIONS, BUT THE EAST MIGHT HAVE ASSIGNED SOME MILITARY UNITS TO THESE FUNCTIONS. TARASOV SAID IT WAS QUITE POSSIBLE THAT SUCH UNITS MIGHT BE DETAILED FOR PERFORMING SUCH FUNCTIONS, BUT THEY WOULD BE UNITS WHICH WERE SUBORDINATE TO MINISTRIES OTHER THAN DEFENSE MINISTRIES AND THEY WERE NOT INCLUDED IN THE EASTERN COUNT. IF WESTERN REPS HAD ANY DOUBTS IN DETERMINING WHETHER THESE UNITS AND SUBUNITS WERE SUBORDINATE TO OTHER MINISTRIES OR DEPARTMENTS,

WESTERN REPS SHOULD ASK EASTERN REPS SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ON THESE  
UNITS AND SUBUNITS AND EASTERN REEPS WOULD GIVE WESTERN REPS  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00425 03 OF 16 121341Z

THE NECESSARY CLARIFICATION AS TO WHETHER THESE UNITS WERE  
PART OF THE REGULAR FORCES OR WHETHER THEY WERE SUBORDINATE  
TO OTHER MINISTRIES AND DEPARTMENTS.

16. US DEPREP SAID HE DID NOT REGARD THIS ANSWER AS RESPONSIVE.  
HOWEVER, HE DID HAVE A SPECIFIC NARROWER QUESTION: HAD THE  
EAST AS OF 1 JANUARY 1976 TEMPORARILY ASSIGNED ANY UNITS OF THE  
REGULAR ARMED FORCES TO OTHER MINISTRIES AND DEPARTMENTS OR  
TO OTHER FUNCTIONS AND FOR THAT REASON EXCLUDED THEM FROM ITS  
FIGURES? TARASOV INDICATED THAT THE EAST WOULD ANSWER THIS QUESTION  
AT A SUBSEQUENT TIME.

17. POLISH REP CONTINUED THAT US DEPREP HAD IN THE JULY 4  
SESSION COMMENTED THAT THE EAST HAD ALLEGEDLY NOT ANSWERED THE  
QUESTION ON POLISH UNITS OF TERRITORIAL DEFENSE, EASTERN REPS  
CONSIDERED THAT THEY HAD ANSWERED ALL THESE QUESTIONS, IN  
PARTICULAR THE QUESTION REGARDING CONSTRUCTION UNITS. HOWEVER,  
EASTERN REPS COULD NOW FURTHER CLARIFY THIS QUESTION. IN THE  
POLISH ARMED FORCES THERE WERE REGULAR ENGINEER UNITS, WHICH,  
BECAUSE THEY WERE SUBORDINATE TO THE MILITARY DISTRICTS HAD  
BEEN INCLUDED IN THE FIRST CATEGORY. OTHER UNITS WHICH THE WEST  
HAD MENTIONED IN ITS QUESTION NUMBER 3 OF JUNE 7 WERE UNITS  
OF TERRITORIAL DEFENSE. THIS FOLLOWED FROM THE SUBSTANCE OF THE  
EAST'S STATEMENT OF 15 MARCH 1977 AS WELL AS FROM THEIR ANSWER  
OF JUNE 20, 1978. THE CONSCRIPT PERSONNEL OF THESE UNITS,  
THAT IS UNITS OTHER THAN ENGINEER UNITS, JUST AS ALL  
CONSCRIPT PERSONNEL OF THE UNITS OF TERRITORIAL DEFENSE, HAD NOT,  
AS WAS KNOWN TO THE WEST, BEEN INCLUDED IN EASTERN FIGURES.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00425 04 OF 16 121356Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 EUR-12 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10  
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05  
SP-02 SS-15 ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /094 W  
-----106896 121402Z /43

P R 121213Z JUL 78  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3075  
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 4 OF 16 MBFR VIENNA 0425

18. AFTER FURTHER QUESTIONS BY WESTERN REPS, STRULAK CLARIFIED THAT HIS ANSWER HAD MEANT THAT THERE WERE ENGINEER UNITS IN THE POLISH REGULAR FORCES, BUT THAT THE UNITS WHICH THE WEST CALLED RAILROAD CONSTRUCTION UNITS AND ENGINEER CONSTRUCTION UNITS WERE FOUND ONLY IN THE POLISH UNITS OF TERRITORIAL DEFENSE. POLISH AUTHORITIES USED THE SINGLE TERM CONSTRUCTION UNITS TO DESCRIBE ALL THESE UNITS.

19. STRULAK SAID THE WEST'S FOURTH QUESTION REFERRED TO POSSIBLE INCREASES IN THE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL OF THE WARSAW TREATY COUNTRIES FOR SERVICING COMBAT EQUIPMENT. THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION WAS, AS WAS WELL KNOWN, IT HAD BEEN UPON THE INSISTENCE OF THE WEST THAT THE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPATING STATES HAD BEEN EXCLUDED FROM THE FIGURES OF THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE PARTIES. IN THIS CONNECTION, EASTERN REPS FAILED TO UNDERSTAND WHAT HAD PROMPTED WESTERN REPS TO RAISE THIS QUESTION ON THE NUMBER OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE WARSAW TREATY FORCES. IF WESTERN REPS CONSIDERED IT ADVISABLE TO EXCHANGE INFORMATION ON THE NUMBER OF CIVILIAN  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00425 04 OF 16 121356Z

PERSONNEL IN THE ARMED FORCES OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPATING STATES AS OF 1 JANUARY 1976 OR ANY OTHER DATE, EASTERN REPS WOULD BE READY TO CONSIDER SUCH A PROPOSAL FROM THE WEST.

20. US DEPREP POINTED OUT THAT, ON JUNE 20, THE EAST HAD ASKED WESTERN REPS ABOUT POSSIBLE INCREASES IN THE NUMBER OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES IN THE NUMBER OF THE US ARMED FORCES. TARASOV CLAIMED THE EAST HAD NOT ASKED A GENERAL QUESTION ABOUT THE INCREASES OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE US ARMED FORCES BUT ABOUT THE SUBSTITUTION OF CIVILIANS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL, WHICH WAS A NARROWER CATEGORY. WESTERN REPS HAD ASKED EASTERN REPS THE SAME QUESTION EARLIER, THAT IS, HAD THE EAST SUBSTITUTED CIVILIAN PERSONNEL FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL? BUT NOW, THE WEST WAS ASKING A MORE GENERAL QUESTION ABOUT INCREASES OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL.

21. POLISH REP SAID THE WEST'S FIFTH QUESTION FROM JULY 4 HAD

BEEN ABOUT THE POLISH MILITARY POLICE. HOWEVER, IN THE POLISH ARMED FORCES THERE WAS NO MILITARY POLICE. IN THEIR QUESTION, WESTERN REPS WERE APPARENTLY REFERRING TO THE INTERNAL MILITARY SERVICE, FOR WHICH THE POLISH ABBREVIATION WSW WAS USED. POLISH REP ASKED WESTERN REPS IF THIS WAS THE ORGANIZATION WHICH WESTERN REPS HAD HAD IN MIND WITH THEIR QUESTION ON JULY 4. WESTERN REPS CONFIRMED THAT IT WAS. POLISH REP CONTINUED THAT THE PERSONNEL OF THIS SERVICE HAD BEEN COUNTED IN THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THE ARMED FORCES AND DIVIDED BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND CATEGORIES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CRITERION OF SUBORDINATION.

22. DRAWING ON TALKING POINTS APPROVED BY THE AD HOC GROUP, NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT IN THE JULY 4 INFORMAL SESSION, AMBASSADOR TARASOV HAD STATED THAT EASTERN REPS HAD REPEATEDLY DEMONSTRATED WHY THE GEOGRAPHIC FACTOR SHOULD NOT PLAY ANY ROLE  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00425 04 OF 16 121356Z

IN ELABORATING AND REACHING AN AGREEMENT. TO THE CONTRARY, OVER THE NEARLY FIVE YEARS OF THESE TALKS, EASTERN REPS HAD NEVER SERIOUSLY DEALT WITH THE REASONS CITED BY THE WEST FOR TAKING GEOGRAPHY FULLY INTO ACCOUNT IN FRAMING THE TERMS OF AN AGREEMENT. THE FAILURE OF EASTERN PARTICIPANTS TO TAKE GEOGRAPHY INTO ACCOUNT WAS ONE OF THE MAJOR REASONS WHY THERE HAD NOT YET BEEN A FIRST AGREEMENT IN THESE TALKS.

23. NETHERLANDS REP STATED THAT TO SUPPLEMENT AMBASSADOR BOLLAND'S REMARKS OF LAST WEEK AS TO HOW THE EASTERN JUNE 8 PROPOSALS DISREGARDED THE GEOGRAPHIC FACTOR, HE NOW WISHED TO SUMMARIZE HOW THE WESTERN POSITION, INCLUDING THE APRIL 19 PROPOSALS, TOOK ACCOUNT OF GEOGRAPHY IN FRAMING OBLIGATIONS. GENUINE PARITY IN MILITARY MANPOWER WITHIN THE REDUCTION AREA AND THE AVOIDANCE OF CONTRACTUALIZING THE EASTERN NUMERICAL SUPERIORITY IN GROUND FORCE MANPOWER WERE FULLY JUSTIFIED ON THEIR OWN MERITS AS A CONTRIBUTION TO ENHANCED STABILITY IN EUROPE. BUT, BEYOND THIS, THE FACTS OF GEOGRAPHY, THE FACT THAT SOVIET HOME TERRITORY DIRECTLY ADJOINED THE REDUCTION AREA, THAT THE SOVIET UNION HAD

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00425 05 OF 16 121414Z

ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 EUR-12 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10

IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05

SP-02 SS-15 ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /094 W

-----107066 121415Z /43

P R 121213Z JUL 78

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3076

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION USNATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 5 OF 16 MBFR VIENNA 0425

VERY LARGE FORCES ON ITS HOME TERRITORY, AND THAT ACTIVE DUTY SOVIET FORCES FROM THE SOVIET UNION WOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE FIRST DAYS OF A POSSIBLE CONFLICT IN THE REDUCTION AREA, MADE ALL THE MORE JUSTIFIABLE THE WESTERN REQUIREMENT FOR ACTUAL PARITY IN MILITARY MANPOWER.

24. NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT THIS WAS WHY AMBASSADOR TARASOV'S STATEMENT ON JULY 4 THAT GEOGRAPHY HAD NO CONNECTION WITH THE DATA CONTROVERSY WAS INCORRECT. WESTERN LEADERS CONCERNED WITH THE SECURITY OF EUROPE HAD TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT NOT ONLY THE NUMERICAL SUPERIORITY OF WARSAW TREATY MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE REDUCTION AREA, BUT THE VERY LARGE STANDING FORCES IN THE WESTERN PART OF THE USSR WHICH WOULD BE INVOLVED AT THE OUTSET OF A POSSIBLE CONFLICT.

25. POLISH REP COMPLAINED THAT THE NETHERLANDS REP WAS ONCE AGAIN SPEAKING IN TERMS OF VIOLATION BY THE EAST OF AN AGREEMENT. THE NETHERLANDS REP WAS FORESEEING A SITUATION WHERE AN AGREEMENT DID NOT WORK. WESTERN REPS SAID THE ONLY RESPONSIBLE COURSE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00425 05 OF 16 121414Z

WAS TO CALCULATE POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF AN AGREEMENT IN A CONFLICT SITUATION. EASTERN REPS WERE DOING THE SAME THING WHEN THEY SOMETIMES CLAIMED THAT SOME ASPECTS OF THE WESTERN PROGRAM MIGHT DIMINISH EASTERN SECURITY.

26. NETHERLANDS REP CONTINUED, MOREOVER, THE GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF THE USSR MEANT THAT THE USSR WOULD BE REQUIRED TO WITHDRAW ITS FORCES ONLY TO THE ADJACENT TERRITORY OF THE USSR, FROM WHICH SUCH FORCES COULD BE READILY RETURNED IN THE EVENT OF CONFLICT. THIS WAS A FURTHER JUSTIFICATION FOR THE SOVIET

WITHDRAWALS OF THE SIZE THE WEST HAD PROPOSED.

27 NETHERLANDS REP STATED THAT TRULY COLLECTIVE MANPOWER CEILINGS WERE NECESSARY TO PERMIT THE INTEGRATED WORKINGS OF THE NATO ALLIANCE, IN ORDER NOT TO PREJUDICE THE FUTURE ORGANIZATION OF WESTERN EUROPEAN DEFENSE, AND TO PERMIT THE ALLIANCE TO MAINTAIN ITS AGREED MANPOWER LEVEL. THIS REQUIREMENT, TOO, WAS ALL THE MORE NECESSARY WHEN ONE TOOK INTO ACCOUNT THE GEOGRAPHIC PROXIMITY OF THE USSR, ITS NUMEROUS AND EASY MEANS OF ACCESS TO THE REDUCTION AREA AND THE LARGE FORCES ON ITS TERRITORY WHICH WOULD NOT BE LIMITED IN SIZE AND MIGHT EVEN INCREASE. THESE REASONS ALSO INTENSIFIED THE NEED FOR A SPECIFIC LIMITATION ON SOVIET MANPOWER IN THE REDUCTION AREA.

28. NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT AMBASSADOR TARASOV AT THE JULY 4 INFORMAL SESSION HAD CRITICIZED THE WESTERN POSITION ON MANPOWER LIMITATIONS ON GROUNDS THAT, IF FOLLOWING AGREED REDUCTIONS, POLAND AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA SHOULD UNILATERALLY REDUCE THEIR FORCES BY 20,000 MEN EACH, THE GDR COULD NOT BE EXPECTED TO INCREASE ITS FORCES BY 40,000 AND THE SOVIET UNION WOULD BE PREVENTED FROM DOING SO UNDER THE LIMITATION ON ITS MANPOWER IN THE REDUCTION AREA PROPOSED BY THE WEST. THIS WAS SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00425 05 OF 16 121414Z

AN INTERESTING HYPOTHETICAL SITUATION. WESTERN REPS WERE NOT AWARE THAT ANY ONE OF THESE FOUR COUNTRIES HAD EVER BEFORE UNILATERALLY REDUCED ITS LEVEL OF MILITARY MANPOWER CONTRARY TO THE WISHES OF THE OTHERS. IN ANY EVENT, IT WAS WORTH NOTING THAT THE WESTERN POSITION WOULD NOT PREVENT THE GDR IN THIS CASE FROM INCREASING ITS FORCES BY 40,000. ON THE OTHER HAND, THE EASTERN JUNE 8 PROPOSAL WOULD PREVENT THE GDR FROM DOING SO.

29. NETHERLANDS REP STATED THAT THE POINT HE WISHED TO EMPHASIZE WAS THAT, EVEN IN A SITUATION SUCH AS THIS, THE GEOGRAPHIC CONTIGUITY OF THE USSR TO THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS WOULD AFFORD THE USSR THE OPPORTUNITY TO MAINTAIN THE TOTAL LEVEL OF ACTIVE DUTY FORCES WHICH WOULD FACE WESTERN FORCES IN THE REDUCTION AREA AT THE OUTSET OF A POSSIBLE CONFLICT, AND EVEN TO INCREASE THAT TOTAL LEVEL. BUT WESTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD NO SUCH ADVANTAGE. THE PRINCIPAL WESTERN MILITARY POWER WAS LOCATED 5000 KILOMETERS AWAY, ACROSS THE ATLANTIC OCEAN. THIS REINFORCED THE IMPORTANCE TO WESTERN PARTICIPANTS OF HAVING THE PRACTICAL MEANS WHICH WAS AFFORDED BY THE WESTERN POSITION OF MAINTAINING WESTERN MANPOWER IN THE AREA AT THE AGREED MANPOWER LEVEL.

30. NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT TURNING TO ANOTHER ASPECT OF THE WESTERN POSITION, A MAJOR REASON FOR WESTERN OPPOSITION TO ARMAMENT REDUCTIONS BY WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN THE US WAS WESTERN UNWILLINGNESS TO CONTRACTUALIZE EASTERN

NUMERICAL SUPERIORITY IN MOST MAJOR ARMAMENTS IN THE REDUCTION AREA. IMPORTANT SUPPLEMENTARY REASONS FOR THIS POSITION WERE TO BE FOUND IN GEOGRAPHY: THE USSR WOULD ONLY HAVE TO WITHDRAW ITS REDUCED ARMAMENTS TO ITS ADJACENT HOME TERRITORY WHERE THEY COULD BE ADDED TO EXISTING STOCKS OF ARMAMENTS. THESE EXISTING STOCKS WERE ALREADY VERY LARGE AND COULD INCREASE FURTHER.

31. NETHERLANDS REP STATED THAT AN AGREEMENT WHICH IGNORED THE IMPORTANT DIFFERENCES IN THE GEOGRAPHIC SITUATION OF VARIOUS PARTICIPANTS AND PLACED IDENTICAL  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00425 05 OF 16 121414Z

OBLIGATIONS ON THE FORCES WITHIN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS OF EACH PARTICIPANT, AS THE JUNE 8 PROPOSALS ADVOCATED, WOULD NOT PLACE ALL THE STATES PARTICIPATING IN THE

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00425 06 OF 16 122246Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10 IO-13  
L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02  
SS-15 ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /094 W  
-----114476 122249Z /62

R 121213Z JUL 78  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3077  
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 6 OF 16 MBFR VIENNA 0425

AGREEMENT IN AN IDENTICAL SITUATION FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THEIR SECURITY. IN FACT, SUCH AN AGREEMENT WOULD CREATE A SITUATION WHERE THE LARGEST EASTERN POWER WAS THE ONLY CONTINENTAL EUROPEAN DIRECT PARTICIPANT WHOSE TOTAL LEVEL OF MILITARY MANPOWER, ARMAMENTS, AND FORCE

STRUCTURE WAS NOT LIMITED IN ANY WAY UNDER THE AGREEMENT. THE WAY TO PLACE ALL STATES IN AN IDENTICAL SITUATION OF UNDIMINISHED SECURITY WAS NOT TO IMPOSE IDENTICAL OBLIGATIONS ON EACH PARTICIPANT REGARDLESS OF EXISTING DIFFERENCES IN THEIR GEOGRAPHIC SUTATION. RATHER, IT WAS TO CONSTRUCT A BALANCED PACKAGE OF OBLIGATIONS FOR REDUCTIONS AND LIMITATIONS ON EITHER SIDE, WHOSE SPECIFIC ELEMENTS TOOK FULL ACCOUNT OF THE GEOGRAPHIC FACTOR. THE WESTERN PROPOSALS DID SO.

32. TARASOV SAID, IN THE COURSE OF THE NEGOTIATIONS, THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES HAD REPEATEDLY TRIED TO CLAIRIFY WHAT THE WEST HAD SPECIFICALLY IN MIND TO REFLECT IN A FUTURE AGREEMENT WHICH WOULD FOLLOW  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00425 06 OF 16 122246Z

FROM THE SO-CALLED GEOGRAPHIC FACTOR. UP TO NOW EASTERN REPS HAD NOT RECEIVED A CLEAR IDEA ABOUT WHICH SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF AN AGREEMENT SHOULD TAKE ACCOUNT OF THIS GEOGRAPHIC FACTOR AND IN WHAT WAY. IN THE LAST INFORMAL SESSION, UK REP HAD MADE WHAT WAS IN TARASOV'S OPINION A USEFUL ATTEMPT TO ENUMERATE THOSE ASPECTS WHICH IN THE WESTERN VIEW JUSTIFIED THE TAKING INTO ACCOUNT OF THE GEOGRAPHIC FACTOR IN SPECIFIC ELEMENTS OF A FUTURE AGREEMENT. IN PARTICULAR, THE UK REP HAD TOUCHED UPON SUCH QUESTIONS AS FORCE REDUCTIONS, SUBSEQUENT LIMITATIONS ON THEIR MANPOWER, REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS, AND THE QUESTION OF THE FORMS OF FORCE REDUCTIONS.

33. TARASOV SAID, IN THE SAME SESSION, EASTERN REPS HAD GIVEN THEIR ANSWER TO ALL ASPECTS TOUCHED UPON BY THE UK REP. AS COULD BE SEEN FROM THIS ANSWER, IN REALITY NONE OF THESE ELEMENTS JUSTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THE GEOGRAPHIC FACTOR A DIFFERENT APPROACH TO ONE OR THE OTHER PARTICIPANT. IN THE PRESENT SESSION, THE NETHERLANDS REP HAD CONTINUED THE THEME TOUCHED UPON BY THE UK REP IN THE LAST SESSION, BUT, UNFORTUNATELY, HE HAD NOT CITED IN FACT SUCH SPECIFIC ELEMENTS. HIS STATEMENT HAD BEEN MAINLY DIRECTED TO DEMONSTRATING THAT THE WESTERN POSITION WAS AIMED AT REACHING PARITY IN GROUND FORCE MANPOWER AND AVOIDANCE OF CONTRACTUALIZING EASTERN SUPERIORITY IN GROUND FORCE MANPOWER. IT WAS QUITE NATURAL THAT ALL THE CONSIDERATION ABOUT DISPARITIES AND ABOUT EASTERN SUPERIORITY IN GROUND FORCE MANPOWER WERE VERY VAGUE ARGUMENTS SINCE THE WEST HAD UNTIL NOW NOT PROVEN AND SUBSTANTIATED ITS STANDPOINT ABOUT THE FACT OF THE EXISTENCE OF SUCH DISPARITIES AND EASTERN SUPERIORITY. IN FACT, THE NETHERLANDS REP HAD TOUCHED ON ONLY ONE SPECIFIC ISSUE, THAT IS, THE NECESSITY OF  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00425 06 OF 16 122246Z

ESTABLISHING SPECIFIC SUB-CEILINGS ON SOVIET FORCE  
MANPOWER IN THE REDUCTION AREA. THE REPRESENTATIVES OF  
THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES HAD ALREADY SET FORTH BROAD  
ARGUMENTS WHICH QUITE CLEARLY DEMONSTRATED THAT THE  
ESTABLISHMENT OF SUCH SUB-CEILINGS ON ABOUT ONE HALF OF  
THE WARSAW TREATY COUNTRIES' FORCES IN THE AREA, WHILE  
THREE FOURTHS OF THE NATO COUNTRIES' FORCES WERE NOT  
COVERED BY NATIONAL SUB-CEILINGS, WOULD BE COMPLETELY  
UNJUSTIFIABLE DISCRIMINATION AND WOULD NOT PERMIT THE  
WARSAW TREATY COUNTRIES TO MAINTAIN A COLLECTIVE CEILING  
EQUAL TO THAT OF THE WESTERN SIDE.

34. TARASOV CONTINUED, IN THIS CONNECTION, IF THE  
WESTERN SIDE INTENDED TO CONTINUE DISCUSSION ON THE  
GEOGRAPHIC FACTOR, EASTERN REPS WOULD WELCOME A SITUATION  
WHERE THE WEST WOULD NOT MERELY REPEAT THE WELL-KNOWN  
ARGUMENT OF THE PROXIMITY OF SOVIET TERRITORY TO THE

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00425 07 OF 16 121422Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 EUR-12 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10  
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05  
SP-02 SS-15 ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /094 W  
-----107193 121429Z /43

P 121213Z JUL 78  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3078  
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 7 OF 16 MBFR VIENNA 0425

REDUCTION AREA AND THE REMOTNESS OF THE US FROM THIS  
AREA, BUT RATHER WOULD DEMONSTRATE SPECIFICALLY, AND

TERMS OF LOGICAL ARGUMENTS, WHICH PROVISIONS IN THE WESTERN  
OPINION SHOULD BE REFLECTED IN A FUTURE AGREEMENT  
WHICH WERE RELATED TO THE GEOGRAPHIC FACTOR.

35. TARASOV SAID HE WOULD NOW LIKE TO CONTINUE  
ANSWERING THE WESTERN QUESTIONS IN THE PROCESS STARTED  
BY THE POLISH REP AT THE OUTSET OF THE SESSION. IN  
PARTICULAR, HE WISHED TO TOUCH UPON THE WEST'S SIXTH  
AND SEVENTH QUESTIONS. IT WAS NOT CUSTOMARY IN THE  
PRACTICE OF NEGOTIATIONS TO DISCUSS THE UNDERLYING MOTIVES  
WHICH PARTICIPANTS HAD IN TAKING ONE OR ANOTHER POSITION.  
AND EASTERN REPS HAD ALL THE RIGHT NOT TO ANSWER SUCH  
QUESTIONS AT ALL. HOWEVER, IN ORDER TO DEMONSTRATE THE  
GROUNDLESSNESS OF WESTERN DEDUCTIONS TO THE EFFECT THAT THE  
EASTERN PARTICIPANTS AT ONE OF THE STAGES OF THE VIENNA  
NEGOTIATIONS ALLEGEDLY ACKNOWLEDGED THE EXISTENCE OF  
DISPARITIES, EASTERN REPS HAD DECIDED, SOLELY ON A  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00425 07 OF 16 121422Z

VOLUNTARY BASIS, TO GIVE WESTERN REPS THE NECESSARY  
CLARIFICATION.

36. TARASOV CONTINUED, THE WEST'S QUESTION 6 HAD CONCERNED THE  
REASONS WHY THE EASTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD NOT IN 1973 TAKEN THE  
SAME POSITION ON THE ISSUE OF ESTABLISHING COMMON  
CEILINGS WHICH THEY HAD TAKEN NOW. THE ANSWER TO THIS  
WAS, IT SHOULD BE WELL KNOWN TO THE WESTERN PARTICIPANTS  
THAT THE EASTERN PARTICIPANTS FROM THE OUTSET AND UNTIL  
RECENTLY HAD NOT EVEN MENTIONED THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ANY  
KIND OF CEILING WHETHER EQUAL OR UNEQUAL ON THE MANPOWER  
OF THE FORCES OF THE SIDES. WESTERN REPS WERE WELL AWARE  
OF THE EASTERN POSITION AT THE TIME. THE CONCEPT OF  
ESTABLISHING A COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING BELONGED TO THE  
WEST. THE EASTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD ADVOCATED THE  
EXCLUSION FROM THE WARSAW TREATY ARMED FORCE MANPOWER  
OF THOSE MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO PERFORMED FUNCTIONS  
SIMILAR TO THOSE IN THE WESTERN ARMIES BY CIVILIANS AND  
HAD ADVOCATED THAT REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES BE CARRIED  
OUT IN AN EQUAL PERCENTAGE BASIS. SUCH AN APPROACH  
CORRESPONDED TO THE IDEA OF THE EASTERN PARTICIPANTS OF  
AN EQUITABLE OUTCOME OF NEGOTIATIONS TO A GREATER DEGREE  
THAN THE WESTERN PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A COMMON COLLECTIVE  
CEILING. IT WAS QUITE LOGICAL FOR THE EAST TO TAKE  
PRECISELY THIS POSITION IN THE EARLIER NEGOTIATING STAGES.  
IT WOULD BE STRANGE TO ASK WESTERN REPS NOW THE QUESTION  
AS TO WHY, IN THE BEGINNING OF THE TALKS, THE WEST HAD STOOD UP  
FOR MAXIMUM DEMANDS FOR THE EAST TO WITHDRAWN TANKS WITHOUT  
OFFERING IN RETURN ANY ARMAMENT REDUCTIONS ON ITS PART  
AND HAD ONLY TWO YEARS LATER PROPOSED TO REDUCE A CERTAIN  
NUMBER OF US NUCLEAR MEANS, OR TO SAY WHY IT HAD TAKEN

ALMOST FIVE YEARS FOR THE WEST TO ABANDON ITS INITIAL  
DEMANDS FOR THE WITHDRAWAL OF AN ENTIRE SOVIET TANK ARMY  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00425 07 OF 16 121422Z

TOGETHER WITH ALL ITS ARMAMENTS AND COMBAT EQUIPMENT. THIS  
WAS THE LOGIC OF NEGOTIATIONS.

37. TARASOV SAID THAT WESTERN QUESTION NUMBER 7 CONCERNED  
THE APPROACH TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CEILINGS IN THE  
ARMED FORCE MANPOWER OF THE TWO SIDES WHICH HAD BEEN TAKEN  
BY THE EASTERN PARTICIPANTS IN THE SPRING OF 1976. SPECIFICALLY,  
THE WEST ASKED WHETHER THE EAST HAD HAD IT IN  
MIND AT THAT TIME TO ACCEPT A CEILING ON WARSAW PACT  
PERSONNEL WHICH WOULD HAD BEEN CONSIDERABLY BELOW  
THE CEILINGS ESTABLISHED FOR THE WEST. THE ANSWER WAS  
THAT, THE EXCLUSION FROM THE COUNT OF THOSE EASTERN  
MILITARY PERSONNEL PERFORMING FUNCTIONS SIMILAR TO THOSE  
PERFORMED BY CIVILIANS IN THE WESTERN COUNTRIES WOULD  
INDEED HAVE BROUGHT ABOUT A CERTAIN DECREASE IN THE FORMAL  
CEILINGS ESTABLISHED FOR THE EASTERN PARTICIPANTS AS  
COMPARED TO THE WESTERN CEILINGS. BUT THIS DIFFERENCE  
WOULD ONLY BE IN THOSE CEILINGS WHICH WOULD HAVE COVERED  
THE REMAINING MILITARY PERSONNEL AFTER THE OTHER GROUP  
OF WARSAW TREATY PERSONNEL. (COMMENT: THOSE PERFORMING FUNCTIONS  
SIMILAR TO THOSE PERFORMED BY CIVILIANS IN THE WESTERN  
COUNTRIES) HAD BEEN EXCLUDED. IN ACTUAL FACT, HOWEVER,  
SUCH CEILINGS WOULD NOT BE LOWER THAN THE WESTERN ONES,  
SINCE THE CATEGORY OF EASTERN MILITARY PERSONNEL WHICH WOULD  
HAVE BEEN EXCLUDED FROM THE FIGURES AND NOT FORMALLY  
COVERED BY CEILINGS WOULD IN REALITY REMAIN IN THE EAST'S  
ARMED FORCES. THUS, THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PERSONNEL OF THE

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00425 08 OF 16 130944Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-01 INR-10 IO-13  
L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02  
SS-15 ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /094 W  
-----123969 130948Z /10  
P 121213Z JUL 78

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3079  
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 8 OF 16 MBFR VIENNA 0425

C O R R E C T E D C O P Y (SECTION 8 OF 16 VICE 8 OF 15)

EASTERN PARTICIPANTS, INCLUDING THE CATEGORY JUST DESCRIBED, WOULD NOT BE LOWER THAN THE TOTAL NUMBER OF MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE WESTERN COUNTRIES. EXCLUSION OF THIS CATEGORY OF EASTERN MILITARY PERSONNEL FROM THE COUNT WOULD HAVE MADE IT POSSIBLE IN THIS CASE NOT TO SUBJECT THEM TO ANY PERCENTAGE REDUCTIONS, JUST AS THE WEST WOULD NOT SUBJECT THE CORRESPONDING CIVILIAN PERSONNEL IN THEIR ARMED FORCES TO ANY REDUCTIONS.

38. TARASOV CONTINUED, AS REGARDS WESTERN REPS' REFERENCE TO THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THIS CATEGORY, DRAWN FROM SOME ANONYMOUS CONVERSATION, IT COULD HARDLY BE CONSIDERED A SERIOUS ONE. EASTERN REPS DID NOT KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT THE EXISTENCE OF SUCH A CONVERSATION. MOREOVER, NO ONE COULD HAVE AT ALL DETERMINED THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THIS CATEGORY WITHOUT CARRYING OUT A COMPLICATED COMPARISON AND CALCULATION AND WITHOUT REACHING AN UNDERSTANDING ON ALL THE CATEGORIES OF PERSONNEL  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00425 08 OF 16 130944Z

PERFORMING SIMILAR FUNCTIONS IN THE WESTERN COUNTRIES. AS WAS KNOWN, THERE WERE NO SUCH CALCULATIONS AND UNDERSTANDINGS, AND THE DISCUSSION OF DEFINITIONS AT THAT TIME WAS NOT COMPLETED. THE EASTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD AGREED NOT TO INSIST ON EXCLUDING THIS SAME CATEGORY PURELY IN THE INTEREST OF COMPROMISE BECAUSE THE WEST HAD NOT AGREED TO ACCEPT THIS EASTERN PROPOSAL AND IT WAS THIS EASTERN APPROACH WHICH HAD PERMITTED EASTERN PARTICIPANTS TO RAISE AT A SUBSEQUENT TIME THE POSSIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILINGS. IT UNAMBIGUOUSLY FOLLOWED FROM ALL THIS THAT THE EASTERN POSITION ON THE SPRING OF 1976 IN NO WAY CONTRADICTED THE STATEMENT OF THE POLISH REP WHICH HAD BEEN CITED BY THE US DEPREP IN THE JULY 4 SESSION. BOTH THEN AND NOW EASTERN REPS DID AND WOULD ADVOCATE PRESERVING IN THE OUTCOME OF REDUCTIONS THE FORCE RELATIONSHIP WHICH HAD EMERGED AND WHICH WAS CHARACTERIZED BY APPROXIMATE PARITY.

39. TARASOV SAID, IN CONCLUSION, HE WANTED TO SAY THAT PARTICIPANTS IN THE TALKS SHOULD CARRY OUT A DISCUSSION

PROCEEDING FROM THE OFFICIAL POSITIONS OF THE SIDES. PARTICIPANTS WOULD WASTE THEIR TIME IN THE EVENT THEY STARTED TO ARBITRARILY INTERPRET PREVIOUS STATEMENTS AND ACTIONS FROM EACH OTHER AND TO DRAW FROM THIS CONCLUSIONS IN WHICH WHAT WAS WISHED FOR WAS TAKEN AS REALITY. IT WOULD BE EVEN WORSE IF PARTICIPANTS SHOULD INFORM THEIR GOVERNMENTS ABOUT THE COURSE OF NEGOTIATIONS USING THIS SHAKY BASIS.

40. US DEPREP THANKED TARASOV FOR HIS REMARKS. ON THE BASIS OF WHAT SOVIET REP HAD JUST SAID REGARDING THE FIRST QUESTION, THERE STILL WAS A QUESTION IN THE MIND OF WESTERN REPS AS TO WHY THE EASTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS HAD WAITED UNTIL 1978 TO ADOPT A POSITION WHICH INVOLVED THE CONCEPT OF PARITY IN MILITARY MANPOWER. THE WEST COULD NOT SEE ANY ISSUE MORE  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00425 08 OF 16 130944Z

GENERAL THAN THAT OF PARITY OF MILITARY MANPOWER WHICH COULD HAVE BEEN DISCUSSED OR RESOLVED AT THE OUTSET OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. WESTERN REPS SAW NO PRACTICAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EQUAL PERCENT-AGE REDUCTIONS FROM AN EXISTING LEVEL TO A COMMON CEILING IF IT WAS CONSIDERED THAT THERE WAS ALREADY PARITY IN THOSE STARTING LEVELS. BUT, FAR FROM BASING THAT POSITION ON PARITY AT THE OUTSET OF THE TALKS, THE EASTERN REPS HAD OFFICIALLY ARGUED THAT REDUCTIONS TO A COMMON CEILING WOULD DIMINISH THEIR SECURITY.

41. US DEPREP SAID THAT, WITH RESPECT TO TARASOV'S REPLY TO THE SEVENTH QUESTION, ALTHOUGH HE DID NOT WISH TO REVIEW THE VERY LARGE VOLUME OF OFFICIAL STATEMENTS BY EASTERN REPS ON THIS TOPIC, HE WISHED TO POINT OUT THAT, IN THE INFORMAL SESSION OF OCTOBER 14, 1975 AN EASTERN REP HAD STATED THAT THERE WERE APPROXIMATELY 300,000 CIVILIANS IN THE WEST FULFILLING DUTIES THAT IN MOST CASES WERE CARRIED OUT BY MILITARY SERVICEMEN IN THE FORCES OF THE WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES. ON MARCH 25, 1974, AN EASTERN REP HAD SAID THAT THE BUNDESWEHR HAD 180,000 CIVILIANS AND THAT THE REMAINING WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS HAD 120,000 CIVILIANS. THE EASTERN REP HAD GONE ON TO SAY THAT ON THE WARSAW PACT SIDE ALL SUCH PERSONNEL WERE SOLDIERS.

42. US DEP REP WISHED TO POINT OUT THAT SOVIET REP HAD JUST STATED THAT NO EFFORT HAD BEEN MADE TO ANALYZE THE CATEGORIES AND FUNCTIONS OF SUCH MILITARY PERSONNEL, BUT IN FACT SUCH AN EFFORT HAD BEEN MADE ON MARCH 9, 196. AN EASTERN REP HAD THEN UNENUMERATED A LIST OF FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY CIVILIANS IN ATO ARMED FORCES BUT BY MILITARY PERSONNEL IN WARSAW PACT ARMED FORCES. THESE FUNCTIONS WERE: GUARD DUTY OF STOREHOUSES AND MILITARY OBJECTS, FIRE BRIGADES FOR GARRISONS AND STOREHOUSES, REPAIR SHOPS AND FACTORIES AND MANY OTHERS. THIS LIST HAD BEEN REPEATED BY AMBASSADOR OESER IN THE

INFORMAL SESSION OF MARCH 30.

43. TARASOV SAID THE EAST HAD ADVOCATED AT THAT  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00425 08 OF 16 130944Z

TIME THE POSITION THAT MILITARY PERSONNEL PERFORMING FUNCTIONS  
IN THE EASTERN FORCES SIMILARLY TO THOSE PERFORMED  
BY CIVILIAN PERSONNEL IN WESTERN FORCES SHOULD BE EXCLUDED  
FROM THE COUNT. ALL STATEMENTS BY EASTERN REPS WHICH HAD  
JUST BEEN CITED BY DEPREP FELL WITHIN THIS EASTERN POSITION.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00425 09 OF 16 121440Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10  
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05  
SP-02 SS-15 ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /094 W  
-----107376 121442Z /50

P 121213Z JUL 78

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3080

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION USNATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

SMEMBASSY LONDON 1992

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 9 OF 16 MBFR VIENNA 0425

44. UK REP SAID HE WOULD NOW RESPOND TO THE QUESTION  
PUT BY THE CZECH REP AT THE END OF HIS STATEMENT IN THE  
JULY 4 SESSION CONCERNING THE WESTERN POSITION ON ARMAMENT  
REDUCTIONS BY WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN THE US.  
DRAWING ON TALKING POINTS APPROVED BY THE AD HOC GROUP,  
UK REP CONTINUED, AS WESTERN REPS HAD EXPLAINED, THE  
CIRCUMSTANCES OF GEOGRAPHY REQUIRED THAT WESTERN MILITARY  
PLANNERS TAKE INTO ACCOUNT NOT ONLY THOSE WARSAW PACT FORCES  
IN REDUCTION AREA, BUT ALSO THOSE ACTIVE DUTY SOVIET FORCES  
IN THE WESTERN PORTION OF THE SOVIET UNION WHICH WOULD BECOME

INVOLVED IN A POSSIBLE CONFLICT AT ITS OUTSET. THIS REQUIRE-  
MENT APPLIED NOT ONLY TO MILITARY MANPOWER BUT ALSO TO  
ARMAMENTS. THE EAST HAD NUMERICAL SUPERIORITY IN MOST MAJOR  
ARMAMENTS IN THE REDUCTION AREA. THE TOTAL NUMBERS OF MAJOR  
ARMAMENTS AT THE DISPOSAL OF WARSAW TREATY FORCES HAD IN-  
CREASED IN RECENT YEARS BOTH IN THE REDUCTION AREA AND IN  
THE WESTERN PART OF THE SOVIET UNION. ACCEPTANCE OF THE  
PRESENT EASTERN APPROACH TO ARMAMENT REDUCTIONS WOULD LIMIT  
TOTAL STOCKS OF REDUCED ARMAMENTS OF THOSE PARTICIPANTS WHOSE  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00425 09 OF 16 121440Z

TERRITORY WAS LOCATED IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS, WHILE THERE  
WOULD BE NO LIMIT ON THE LARGE STOCKS OF ARMAMENTS IN  
THE NEARBY SOVIET UNION AND THEIR LEVEL COULD EVEN INCREASE.

45. UK REP STATED THAT FOR THE WESTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES  
TO ACCEPT REDUCTION OR LIMITATION OF THEIR ARMAMENTS  
IN THESE CIRCUMSTANCES COULD CONTRACTUALIZE EASTERN  
SUPERIORITIES IN THE AREA AND WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO  
WESTERN SECURITY IN VIEW OF THE SIZE OF THE TOTAL STOCK  
OF WARSAW PACT ARMAMENTS WHICH WOULD BE BROUGHT TO BEAR  
AGAINST THE WEST AT THE OUTSET OF A POSSIBLE CONFLICT.  
THEREFORE, AND THIS WAS IN REPLY TO AMBASSADOR KEBLUSEK'S  
QUESTION IN THE JULY 4 INFORMAL SESSION, THE WEST'S POSITION  
OF PRINCIPLED OPPOSITION TO ARMAMENT REDUCTIONS BY THE  
WESTERN EUROPEAN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AND CANADA CONTINUED  
TO BE VALID. THIS WAS A MAJOR REASON WHY WESTERN PARTICI-  
PANTS COULD NOT UNDERTAKE A COMMITMENT IN PHASE I TO REDUCE  
THEIR ARMAMENTS IN PHASE II. AT THE SAME TIME, WESTERN  
PARTICIPANTS ALSO STOOD BY THE PREVIOUSLY STATED VIEW THAT  
THE TOPIC OF ARMAMENT REDUCTIONS WAS NOT PRECLUDED FROM THE  
SUBJECT MATTER OF PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS IF EASTERN PARTICIPANTS  
WISHED TO RAISE IT AT THAT TIME.

46. UK REP SAID WESTERN REPS NOW HAD THREE QUESTIONS ON  
THE JUNE 8 PROPOSALS. THE FIRST QUESTION WAS, WHAT TYPE  
OF RESIDUAL LIMITATIONS DID THE EAST ENVISAGE FOR ARMED  
REDUCTIONS IN PHASE II BY DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN  
THE US AND USSR WHICH THE EAST WAS PROPOSING IN ITS JUNE 8  
PROPOSAL? WOULD THESE LIMITATIONS BE COLLECTIVE OR  
REDUCED IN THE FORCES OF A GIVEN COUNTRY, WHETHER OR NOT  
IN ACTIVE DUTY UNITS?

47. TARASOV SAID HE COULD ANSWER THIS QUESTION IN A  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00425 09 OF 16 121440Z

GENERAL WAY. EASTERN PARTICIPANTS WERE PROPOSING THAT ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD UNDERTAKE IN A FIRST AGREEMENT A GENERAL COMMITMENT ON THE REDUCTION OF THEIR ARMAMENTS IN THE SECOND STAGE. AS FAR AS THE TYPES OF ARMAMENTS WERE CONCERNED, OR THE QUESTION OF THE ENSUING LIMITATIONS, OR THE ISSUE OF WHETHER THESE LIMITATIONS WOULD BE OF INDIVIDUAL OR COLLECTIVE NATURE, ALL THESE ISSUES COULD BECOME THE SUBJECT MATTER OF DISCUSSION FOR THE SECOND STAGE.

48. UK REP SAID THE WEST'S SECOND QUESTION WAS: UNDER THE EAST'S JUNE 8 PROPOSALS, WOULD THE 1,000 TANKS WHICH THE SOVIET UNION PROPOSED TO WITHDRAW BE MADE UP BY WITHDRAWING THE TANKS OF THE TWO COMPLETE DIVISIONS TO BE WITHDRAWN, PLUS THE TANKS OF THE ADDITIONAL TANK UNITS TO WHICH AMBASSADOR TARASOV HAD REFERRED IN THE LAST INFORMAL SESSION?

49. TARASOV SAID YES, THE UK REP'S UNDERSTANDING WAS CORRECT. THE 1,000 TANKS TO BE WITHDRAWN WOULD BE MADE UP BY WITHDRAWING THE TANKS OF THE TWO DIVISIONS, AND THE REMAINING NUMBER OF TANKS NECESSARY TO MAKE UP 1,000 WOULD BE WITHDRAWN TANKS OF THOSE ADDITIONAL UNITS AND SUBUNITS.

50. UK REP SAID THE THIRD QUESTION WAS: IN THE LAST INFORMAL SESSION, AMBASSADOR TARASOV HAD POINTED OUT THAT

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00425 10 OF 16 130804Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-01 INR-10 IO-13  
L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02  
SS-15 ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /094 W  
-----122336 130808Z /10

P 121213Z JUL 78  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3081  
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 10 OF 16 MBFR VIENNA 0425

C O R R E C T E D C O P Y ( SECTION 10 OF 16 VICE 10 OF 15)

UNDER THE EAST'S JUNE 8 PROPOSALS, PARTICIPANTS COULD NOT INCREASE THE NUMBER OF CIVILIANS OCCUPYING POSITIONS WHICH COULD BE FILLED EITHER BY CIVILIANS OR MILITARY PERSONNEL, BUT COULD INCREASE THE NUMBER OF MILITARY PERSONNEL IN SUCH POSITIONS. WESTERN REPS ASSUMED AMBASSADOR TARASOV MEANT BY THIS THAT THE NUMBER OF MILITARY PERSONNEL OCCUPYING SUCH POSITIONS COULD BE INCREASED, BUT ONLY AS LONG AS CEILINGS ON THE TOTAL NUMBER OF MILITARY PERSONNEL OF EACH PARTICIPANT WERE RESPECTED. OR DID AMBASSADOR TARASOV HAVE A DIFFERENT CONCEPT IN MIND?

51. TARASOV SAID, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE EAST'S PROPOSAL OF JUNE 8, IN THE CASE OF UNILATERAL REDUCTIONS BY ONE OF THE PARTICIPANTS, ITS ALLIES UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS COULD INCREASE THE NUMBER OF THEIR MILITARY PERSONNEL. IT WAS QUITE CLEAR THAT, FOR SUCH AN INCREASE, IT WAS NECESSARY TO CREATE AN ADDITIONAL NUMBER OF MILITARY POSITIONS.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00425 10 OF 16 130804Z

THIS WAS WHY THE INCREASE OF THE NUMBER OF MILITARY PERSONNEL IN MILITARY POSITIONS SHOULD BE PROVIDED FOR IN AN AGREEMENT, OR PARTICIPANTS COULD AGREE ON THIS IF NOT PROVIDED FOR IN AN AGREEMENT. EASTERN PARTICIPANTS WERE PROPOSING TO ESTABLISH A LIMITATION ON CIVILIAN PERSONNEL SUBSTITUTING FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL IN MILITARY POSITIONS SINCE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL WOULD NOT BE COVERED BY THE OVERALL LIMITATION, AND THUS THROUGH THE INCREASE OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL A COVERT INCREASE OF ARMED FORCES COULD TAKE PLACE. IT WAS QUITE NATURAL, AND UK REP UNDERSTOOD THIS CORRECTLY, THAT THE NUMBER OF MILITARY PERSONNEL IN MILITARY POSITIONS, THAT IS, POSITIONS WHICH COULD BE FILLED BOTH BY CIVILIAN AND MILITARY PERSONNEL COULD NOT BE INCREASED AND THE PURELY MILITARY POSITIONS WHICH COULD BE INCREASED SHOULD BE REGULATED BY THE GENERAL RULES ESTABLISHED FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF CEILINGS.

52. UK REP POINTED OUT THAT IN THE JUNE 27 INFORMAL SESSION, TARASOV HAD UNDERTAKEN TO ANSWER LATER THE QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE FRG REP AND THE ACTING CANADIAN REP AS TO HOW THE 50 PERCENT RULE WOULD APPLS TO UNIT LIMITATIONS.

53. TARASOV SAID EASTERN REPS WERE STUDYING THIS QUESTION.

54. GDR REP SAID EASTERN REPS WOULD NOW LIKE TO ASK WESTERN REPS A FEW QUESTIONS. FIRST, HE WISHED TO START WITH SOME BACKGROUND TO THESE QUESTIONS. WESTERN REPS

WOULD RECALL THAT EASTERN REPS HAD REFERRED SEVERAL TIMES TO THE ACTUAL EXCLUSIONS FROM THE NUMBERS FOR THE EASTERN ARMED FORCES STRENGTH IN CENTRAL EUROPE WHICH THE EAST HAD MADE AT THE TIME WHEN IT DETERMINED THE TOTAL NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF ITS FORCES. EASTERN REPS HAD STATED THAT IN DOING SO,

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00425 10 OF 16 130804Z

THEY HAD NOT INCLUDED IN THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL, THE PERSONNEL OF NAVAL FORCES, BORDER TROOPS, RESERVISTS, CIVILIAN PERSONNEL WORKING WITH THE ARMED FORCES, THE FORMATIONS OF MINISTRIES AND DEPARTMENTS SUCH AS THE MINISTRY OF INTERIOR, MINISTRY OF JUSTICE, RAILWAY AND COMMUNICATIONS; ORGANS FOR MAINTAINING STATE SECURITY; ORGANS OF FIRE AND CUSTOMS SERVICES; AND PERSONNEL FOR THE PROTECTION OF ENTERPRISES AND INSTALLATIONS, AMONG THEM INDIVIDUAL CATEGORIES WHICH MIGHT WEAR A SPECIAL UNIFORM AND CARRY ARMS. (COMMENT: GDR REP MADE CLEAR THAT, ALTHOUGH THE TRANSLATION MIGHT VARY SLIGHTLY, HE WAS IN FACT GIVING THE SAME LIST PRESENTED BY TARASOV IN THE INFORMAL SESSION OF MAY 31, 1977).

55. GDR REP SAID THAT, IN TALKING ABOUT SPECIFIC PARTICULARITIES OF THIS OR THAT COUNTRY, EASTERN REPS WISHED TO POINT TO THE FOLLOWING EXCLUSIONS: (COMMENT: ALSO FROM MAY 31, 1977 )8 58,&):

I. FOR THE GDR, THE PEOPLES POLICE, WITH ALL THEIR BRANCHES AND SERVICES, AMONG THEM ALSO SUBUNITS ACCOMMODATED IN BARRACKS, I.E., THE BEREITSCHAFTEN DER VOLKSPOLIZEI. FOR THE POLISH PEOPLES' REPUBLIC, THE NON-PERMANENT CONSCRIPT PERSONNEL OF THE TERRITORIAL DEFENSE UNITS AND THE CITIZENS MILITIA. FOR THE CSSR THE PUBLIC SECURITY SERVICE WITH ALL ITS BRANCHES AND TYPES OF SERVICE, ROAD DIRECTION, INLAND WATERWAY SERVICE, ETC. FOLLOWING THIS ELUCIDATION BY EASTERN REPS, NO EXPLANATION WHATSOEVER HAD BEEN MADE BY WESTERN REPS. EASTERN REPS PROCEEDED FROM THE ASSUMPTION, AND BELIEVED IT CORRECT, THAT AGREEMENT EXISTED BETWEEN EAST AND WEST ON ALL EXCLUSIONS THAT HAD BEEN MADE FROM THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF WESTERN AND EASTERN FORCES. HOWEVER, RECENT DISCUSSION OF THE DATA MATERIAL HAD SHOWN THAT THIS WAS NOT THE CASE. IN PARTICULAR, MANY AND EVEN REPEATED QUESTIONS WERE BEING ASKED BY WESTERN REPS WITH REGARD TO ONE AND THE SAME

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00425 10 OF 16 130804Z

CATEGORIES OF THE PERSONNEL OF SOVIET FORCES, OF THE

FORCES OF THE POLISH PEOPLES REPUBLIC AND OF THE GDR.  
THIS SITUATION SUGGESTED THE IDEA THAT WESTERN REPS, ALTHOUGH  
FORMALLY THEY HAD NO OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE CATEGORIES  
EASTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD EXCLUDED FROM ITS NUMBERS, IN  
REALITY ADHERED TO A DIFFERENT POSITION, AND, AS IT SEEMED  
TO EASTERN REPS, WERE, WITHOUT ANY MOTIVATION IN THIS REGARD,  
INCLUDING SOME OF THOSE CATEGORIES OF PERSONNEL, OR PART  
OF THEM, IN THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THE FORCES OF THE  
WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00425 11 OF 16 121507Z

ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10

IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05

SP-02 SS-15 ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /094 W

-----107970 121535Z /40

P 121213Z JUL 78

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3082

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION USNATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 11 OF 16 MBFR VIENNA 0425

96. GDR REP CONTINUED, IN THIS CONNECTION, EASTERN REPS  
WISHED TO RECALL THE STATEMENT WHICH HAD BEEN MADE BY  
SOVIET REP ON 4 APRIL 1977. AMONG OTHER THINGS, HIS  
STATEMENT HAD SAID QUOTE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POSITIONS  
OF THE NATO COUNTRIES, AS SET FORTH BY WESTERN REPS, ESPE-  
CIALLY AT THE INFORMAL SESSIONS OF 11 NOVEMBER 1975 AND  
12 MARCH 1976, THE QUESTION OF THE CATEGORIES OF PERSONNEL  
TO BE EXCLUDED FROM THE COMPUTATION OF THE NUMERICAL  
STRENGTH OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE TWO SIDES WAS TO BE  
SOLVED IN THE FORM OF A PACKAGE. WESTERN REPS ON 12 MARCH  
1976, FOR EXAMPLE, HAD STATED THAT THEY WERE READY TO  
INCLUDE IN THE CATEGORIES THAT WERE TO BE EXCLUDED BORDER  
GUARD FORCES, FORCES OF MINISTRIES OF THE INTERIOR, OR OTHER  
SIMILAR FORMATIONS, AS WELL AS THE PERSONNEL OF PARA-  
MILITARY ORGANIZATIONS IN EASTERN COUNTRIES, IF FROM THE

DEFINITION OF ARMED FORCES RESERVISTS, CIVILIAN PERSONNEL  
AND PERSONNEL OF OTHER ORGANIZATIONS IN UNIFORM AND  
CARRYING ARMS WERE EXCLUDED UNQUOTE. WHEN SETTING FORTH  
THEIR PRINCIPLES FOR COUNTING, REPRESENTATIVES OF EASTERN  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00425 11 OF 16 121507Z

COUNTRIES, IN THE MEETING OF 15 FEBRUARY 1977 AND OTHER  
MEETINGS HAD UNEQUIVOCALLY STATED THAT THEY WERE READY TO  
EXCLUDE THESE THREE CATEGORIES OF PERSONNEL MENTIONED BY  
THE WEST. EASTERN REPS HAD DONE SO WHILE TAKING INTO  
CONSIDERATION THE STANDPOINT OF THE NATO COUNTRIES BECAUSE  
THEY HAD BEEN GUIDED BY THE ENDEAVOR TO BRING THE POSITIONS  
OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS CLOSER TOGETHER  
AND TO ACHIEVE PROGRESS IN THE SEARCH FOR MUTUALLY  
ACCEPTABLE SOLUTIONS. IN THIS CONNECTION, EASTERN REPS  
WISHED, HOWEVER, TO EMPHASIZE WITH ALL DETERMINATION THAT  
EASTERN REPS CONSIDERED IT POSSIBLE TO SOLVE THE QUESTION  
OF EXCLUSIONS ON THE BASIS OF MUTUALITY AS A COMPLEX, OR  
AS WESTERN REPS SAID, AS A PACKAGE. IN OTHER WORDS, EASTERN  
REPS WERE STATING THEIR READINESS TO EXCLUDE THE CATEGORIES  
MENTIONED BY THE WEST IF THE NATO COUNTRIES FOR THEIR PART  
AGREED TO THE EXCLUSION OF THE CATEGORIES MENTIONED BY  
THE EAST.

57. GDR REP SAID, IN VIEW OF SOME QUESTIONS WHICH  
HAD BEEN ASKED BY WESTERN REPS, AT THIS POINT THERE HAD  
ARISEDN THE IMPRESSION THAT WESTERN REPS INTENDED TO SOLVE THE  
QUESTION OF EXCLUSIONS NOT ON THE BASIS OF THE AGREED  
PACKAGE BUT SELECTIVELY, THAT IS, PROCEEDING FROM THE GENERAL  
WESTERN POSITION ON NUMBERS. IF THIS WAS REALLY SO,  
EASTERN REPS WERE COMPELLED TO STATE THAT EASTERN REPS  
WOULD ALSO TAKE THE SAME POSITION AND WOULD NOT AGREE TO THE  
EXCLUSION OF ALL OF THOSE CATEGORIES MENTIONED BY THE  
WEST. THIS WAS WHY EASTERN REPS WISHED TO COME BACK AGAIN  
TO THIS QUESTION IN ORDER TO DEFINE QUITE UNEQUIVOCALLY  
THE CATEGORIES, NOT FORMALLY BUT IN REALITY, WHICH HAD  
BEEN EXCLUDED BY THE WEST FROM THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF  
FORCES OF THE WARSAW TREATY COUNTRIES AND THE CATEGORIES WHICH  
HAD BEEN INCLUDED BY THE WEST. WITHOUT AGREEMENT ON THESE  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00425 11 OF 16 121507Z

QUESTIONS, THE DATA DISCUSSION WOULD BECOME FORMALIZED AND  
WOULD BE WITHOUT SUBSTANCE.

58. GDR REP CONTINUED, IN THIS CONNECTION EASTERN  
REPS WOULD BE GRATEFUL IF WESTERN REPS COULD

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS, IF POSSIBLE ALREADY IN THE PRESENT SESSION: FIRST, HAD THE WEST EXCLUDED FROM ITS ESTIMATES OF THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE WARSAW TREATY COUNTRIES THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PERSONNEL OF THE NAVAL FORCES, INCLUDING THE POLISH COASTAL DEFENSE UNIT?

59. US DEP REP SAID THAT IT WAS CORRECT THAT THE WEST HAD EXCLUDED ALL PERSONNEL KNOWN TO BE NAVAL PERSONNEL EXCEPT FOR THE PERSONNEL OF THE POLISH SEA LANDING DIVISION WHICH THE WEST HAD NOT CONSIDERED TO BE A PART OF NAVAL FORCES.

60. WESTERN REPS URGED GDR REP TO GIVE THE COMPLETE LIST OF EASTERN QUESTIONS BEFORE THEY ANSWERED FURTHER QUESTIONS.

61. GDR REP SAID THE SECOND QUESTION WAS, HAD THE WEST EXCLUDED FROM ITS ESTIMATES THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PERSONNEL OF THE BORDER GUARD FORCES OF THE GDR, POLAND AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA REGARDLESS OF THEIR SUBORDINATION OR HAD THE WEST INCLUDED SOME PART OF THESE PERSONNEL IN THE ARMED FORCES OF THE ABOVE-MENTIONED STATES?

62. GDR REP SAID HIS THIRD QUESTION WAS, HAD THE WESTERN REPS EXCLUDED FROM THEIR ESTIMATES OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE GDR, POLISH PEOPLES' REPUBLIC AND CZECHOSLOVAK SOCIALIST REPUBLIC, THE FORMATIONS OF OTHER MINISTRIES AND DEPARTMENTS SUCH AS THE MINISTRY OF INTERIOR, MINISTRY OF JUSTICE, RAILROADS AND COMMUNICATIONS AND ORGANS FOR MAINTAINING STATE SECURITY? TO BE SPECIFIC, FOR THE GDR,

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00425 12 OF 16 121542Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10  
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05  
SP-02 SS-15 ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /094 W  
-----108711 121551Z /40

P 121213Z JUL 78  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3083  
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 12 OF 16 MBFR VIENNA 0425

THE PEOPLES' POLICE WITH ALL BRANCHES AND SERVICES, AMONG THEM ALSO THE SUBUNITS ACCOMMODATED IN BARRACKS, I.E. THE BEREITSCHAFTEN DER VOLKSPOLIZEI. FOR THE POLISH PEOPLES' REPUBLIC, THE CONSCRIPT PERSONNEL OF THE TERRITORIAL DEFENSE UNITS, AS WELL AS THE CITIZENS MILITIA. AND FOR CZECHOSLIVAKIA, THE PUBLIC SECURITY SERVICE WITH ALL ITS BRANCHES AND KINDS OF SERVICE, AS ROAD SERVICE, INLAND WATERWAY SERVICE, ETC.?

63. GDR REP SAID HIS FOURTH QUESTION WAS, HAD THE WEST EXCLUDED FROM ITS ESTIMATES OF THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THE FORCES OF THE EASTERN PARTICIPANTS THE ORGANS OF CUSTOMS AND FIREFIGHTING SERVICES, AS WELL AS THE PERSONNEL FOR THE PROTECTION OF ENTERPRISES AND INSTITUTIONS, AMONG THEM INDIVIDUAL CATEGORIES WHICH MIGH WEAR A SPECIAL UNIFORM AND CARRY ARMS?

64. GDR REP SAID HIS FIFTH QUESTION WAS, RECENTLY WESTERN REPS HAD ASKED VERY MANY QUESTIONS REGARDING THE PERSONNEL  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00425 12 OF 16 121542Z

OF THE SERVICE SUPPORT SUBUNITS AND COMMANDS OF THE SOVIET FORCES ENUMERATED IN LIST A. IN EASTERN REPLIES, EASTERN REPS HAD EXPLAINED THATTHE PERSONNEL OF ALL OF THESE UNITS AND COMMANDS HAD BEEN INCLUDED BY THE EAST IN THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THE SOVIET FORCES IN THE REDUCTION AREA AND THAT NO EXCLUSIONS HAD BEEN MADE FROM THE COMPUTATIONS.

AS REGARDS THE ALLOCATION OF THESE TWO CATEGORIES, EASTERN REPS HAD POINTED OUT THAT THOSE SUBUNITS AND COMMANDS WHICH SERVED ARMIES HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN THE FIRST CATEGORY AND THAT THOSE SUBUNITS AND COMMANDS WHICH EXERCISED THEIR FUNCTIONS IN THE INTERESTS OF UNITS WHICH WERE DIRECTLY SUBORDINATE TO THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE SOVIET GROUP OF FORCES IN THE GDR HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN THE SECOND CATEGORY. EASTERN REPS WISHED TO ASK HOW THE WEST HAD CALCULATED THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THESE SUBUNITS AND COMMANDS OF SOVIET FORCES AND IN WHAT WAY THIS NUMERICAL STRENGTH HAD BEEN ALLOCATED TO THE TWO CATEGORIES. HAD THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THESE SUBUNITS AND COMMANDS PERHAPS BEEN COUNTED TWICE, THE FIRST TIME IN THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF SOVIET ARMIES, AND THE SECOND TIME AS INDEPENDENT SUBUNITS FOR COMMANDS, THE STRENGTH OF WHICH HAD BEEN ADDED TO THE TOTAL NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF SOVIET FORCES IN THE AREA?

65. GDR REP SAID QUESTION SIX WAS, AS EASTERN REPS UNDERSTOOD IT, THERE WERE NO DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE WEST AND THE EAST ON THE QUESTION OF ESTABLISHING COLLECTIVE LEVELS AS A RESULT OF THE REDUCTIONS OF THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THE ARMED FORCES OF BOTH SIDES THE 900,000 MEN, AMONG THEM 700,000 MEN FOR GROUND FORCES. IN THIS CONNECTION, EASTERN REPS WISHED TO CLARIFY WHETHER THEY UNDERSTOOD CORRECTLY THAT THE WESTERN DIRECT

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00425 12 OF 16 121542Z

PARTICIPANTS INTENDED TO REDUCE THEIR FORCES BY 91,000 MEN IN ORDER TO REACH A COMMON COLLECTIVE LEVEL OF 700,000 MEN IN GROUND FORCES?

66. GDR REP SAID HIS SEVENTH QUESTION WAS, IN THE JULY 4 INFORMAL SESSION, THE NETHERLANDS REP HAD POINTED OUT THAT THE REORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN FORCES IN EUROPE CARRIED THROUGH IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NUNN AMENDMENT HAD LED TO THE REPLACEMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL EXERCISING SUCH FUNCTIONS AS POSTAL SERVICE, TRANSPORT, EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE AND MEDICAL SERVICES AND THEREFORE OCCUPYING MILITARY POSITIONS, BY CIVILIAN PERSONNEL.

67. NETHERLANDS REP SAID HE HAD NOT USED THESE WORDS QUOTE OCCUPYING MILITARY POSITIONS UNQUOTE IN HIS REMARKS ON JULY 4.

68. GDR REP CONTINUED EASTERN REPS UNDERSTOOD THIS TO MEAN THAT THESE MILITARY POSITIONS IN THE US FORCES IN EUROPE WERE NOW FILLED BY CIVILIAN PERSONNEL. DID EASTERN REPS UNDERSTAND THIS CORRECTLY? FURTHERMORE, EASTERN REPS WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHETHER THERE WERE MILITARY POSITIONS IN THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UK, BELGIUM, NETHERLANDS, CANADA AND LUXEMBOURG IN THE REDUCTION AREA WHICH MIGHT BE OCCUPIED EITHER BY CIVILIAN PERSONNEL OR BY ACTIVE DUTY PERSONNEL?

69. GDR REP SAID HIS LAST QUESTION WAS, THE WEST HAD REPLIED TO AN EASTERN QUESTION THAT THE PERSONNEL IN THE FRG TERRITORIAL ARMY, REGIONAL AND DISTRICT STAFFS-- VERTEIDIGUNGSBEZIRK- AND VERTEIDIGUNGSKREISKOMMANDOES-- AS WELL AS OF THE UNITS AND SUBUNITS SUBORDINATE TO THEM, HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN THE WEST'S FIGURES AND HAD BEEN COUNTED IN THE SECOND CATEGORY. IT WAS KNOWN TO EASTERN REPS THAT IN ADDITION TO REGULAR AND DISTRICT STAFFS, THERE WERE HIGHER LEVEL STAFFS IN THE FRG TERRITORIAL ARMY.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00425 12 OF 16 121542Z

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00425 13 OF 16 121529Z

ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10

IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05

SP-02 SS-15 ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /094 W

-----108575 121536Z /50

P 121213Z JUL 78

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3084

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION USNATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 13 OF 16 MBFR VIENNA 0425

DID EASTERN REPS UNDERSTAND IT CORRECTLY THAT THE WEST HAD ALLOCATED THE PERSONNEL OF THESE STAFFS AND OF THE FORMATIONS, UNITS AND SUBUNITS SUBORDINATE TO THEM ALSO TO THE SECOND CATEGORY?

70. WESTERN REPS WITHDREW TO CAUCUS. FOLLOWING THE CAUCUS, US DEP REP SAID THAT, IN ORDER TO EXPEDITE THE WORK OF THE INFORMAL SESSIONS, WESTERN REPS WOULD NOW TRY TO GIVE REPLIES TO THE EAST'S 8 QUESTIONS, OR SOME OF THEM, BUT THE WEST OF COURSE RESERVED THE RIGHT TO RETURN TO THESE QUESTIONS AT A LATER DATE.

71. US DEP REP SAID QUESTION 1 HAD ALREADY BEEN ANSWERED. AS FOR QUESTIONS 2, 3 AND 4, THE WEST COULD TELL THE EAST AGAIN TODAY, AS IT HAD ON MAY 31, THAT IT HAD EXCLUDED THE PERSONNEL OF THE ORGANIZATIONS CITED IN QUESTIONS 2, 3 AND 4 AS FAR AS THE WEST WAS ABLE TO IDENTIFY THESE PERSONNEL AS ACTUALLY BELONGING TO THOSE ORGANIZATIONS. IN OTHER WORDS, THE WEST HAD MADE A GOOD FAITH EFFORT TO IDENTIFY THEM CORRECTLY.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00425 13 OF 16 121529Z

72. US DEP RES SAID, IN ANSWER TO QUESTION 5, THE WEST HAD MADE EVERY EFFORT TO AVOID DOUBLE COUNTING AND THAT THE WEST WAS NOT AWARE OF ANY CASE IN WHICH IT HAD COUNTED PERSONNEL TWICE.

73. US DEP REP SAID QUESTION 6 WAS SCARCELY A DATA QUESTION IN THE ORDINARY SENSE. IN ANY EVENT, THE WEST HAD REPEATEDLY EXPRESSED THE IEW, WHICH CONTINUED VALID, THAT IT WAS NECESSARY THAT BOTH SIDES AGREE ON THE MANPOWER DATA FOR EACH SIDE PRIOR TO REACHING AGREEMENT ON THE SPECIFIC SIZE OF REDUCTIONS. IN ADDITION, THE WEST HAD MADE THE POINT, AS EASTERN REPS THEMSELVES HAD, THAT THIS UNDERSTANDING ON DATA WOULD HAVE TO BE UPDATED AT THE TIME THE AGREEMENT WAS CONCLUDED. WITH DUE ACCOUNT OF THESE TWO CONDITIONS, THE FIGURES CITED WERE APPROXIMATELY CORRECT.

74. US DEP REP SAID THAT AS TO THE QUESTION CONCERNING THE NUNN AMENDMENT, THE NETHERLANDS REP HAD MENTIONED IN JULY 4 SESSION THAT THE ONLY ARMED FORCES OF A WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANT WHICH CONTAINED POSITIONS DESIGNATED FOR DUAL OCCUPANCY, THAT IS OCCUPANCY BY EITHER CIVILIANS OR MILITARY PERSONNEL, WAS THE FRG. SUCH POSITIONS DID NOT EXIST IN THE ARMED FORCES OF ANY OTHER WESTERN COUNTRY, INCLUDING THE US. AS FOR THE QUESTION CONCERNING FRG TERRITORIAL FORCES, THE WEST WOULD ANSWER LATER.

75. US DEP REP SAID WEST NOW HAD SOME QUESTIONS TO ASK EAST.

76. DRAWING ON TALKING POINTS APPROVED BY THE AD HOC GROUP, US DEP REP SAID THAT WESTERN REPS WOULD NOW LIKE TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS WHICH EASTERN REPS  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00425 13 OF 16 121529Z

HAD ASKED ON JULY 4 REGARDING WESTERN DATA. IN THEIR FIRST QUESTION, EASTERN REPS HAD ASKED FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE CATEGORY QUOTE RESERVISTS WHO WERE PERMANENTLY ON ACTIVE DUTY UNQUOTE. WHAT WAS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THESE RESERVISTS AND ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL? THE ANSWER WAS THAT FOR PURPOSES OF COUNTING MILITARY PERSONNEL IN WESTERN DATA, THERE WAS NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THIS CATEGORY OF RESERVISTS AND ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL.

77. US DEP REP STATED THAT, IN THEIR SECOND QUESTION,

EASTERN REPS HAD ASKED WHETHER THE PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO THE VERFUEGUNGSBEREITSCHAFT, THE STANDBY READINESS OF THE FRG ARMED FORCES, HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN WESTERN FIGURES, AND, IF SO, IN WHICH CATEGORY, GROUND OR AIR FORCES. IN ADDITION, EASTERN REPS HAD ASKED IF THERE WERE SUCH MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE ARMED FORCES OF OTHER WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. THE ANSWER WAS THAT MEMBERS OF THE STANDBY READINESS WERE NOT PART OF THE ACTIVE DUTY FORCES OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY. AS WESTERN REPS HAD INFORMED EASTERN REPS ON MARCH 29, 1977 AND SEVERAL PREVIOUS OCCASIONS, THESE PERSONNEL WERE CIVILIANS WHO HAD RESERVE STATUS. ACCORDINGLY, THEY HAD BEEN EXCLUDED FROM WESTERN FIGURES ON ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL. WITH

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00425 14 OF 16 121552Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10  
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05  
SP-02 SS-15 ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /094 W  
-----108791 121554Z /40

P R 121213Z JUL 78  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3085  
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE BRUSSELS BEL  
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GER

S E C R E T SECTION 14 OF 16 MBFR VIENNA 0425

REFERENCE TO THE SECOND PART OF THE QUESTION, AS TO WHETHER THERE WERE SUCH PERSONNEL IN OTHER WESTERN FORCES, IN THE NETHERLANDS FORCES ONLY, THERE EXISTED A CATEGORY KNOWN AS SHORT LEAVE PERSONNEL. HOWEVER, AS WAS THE CASE WITH THE FRG STANDBY READINESS RESERVE, AND AS WESTERN REPS HAD ANSWERED ON JULY 5, 1977 AND EARLIER, THE NETHERLANDS SHORT LEAVE PERSONNEL WERE RESERVISTS WHO DID NOT FILL POSITIONS IN THE ACTIVE MILITARY FORCES. THEREFORE, THEY HAD BEEN EXCLUDED FROM WESTERN MILITARY FIGURES. ON THE STRENGTH OF THE GDR REPS REMARKS IN THE PRESENT SESSION AND OF EARLIER EASTERN STATEMENTS, WESTERN REPS ANSWERED THAT THE EAST CONTINUED TO

AGREE TO THE EXCLUSION OF ALL RESERVISTS INCLUDING THOSE WHICH THE US DEP REP HAD JUST MENTIONED. IF THIS WAS NOT THE CASE, EASTERN REPS SHOULD SO STATE.

78. US DEP REP SIAD, IN THIER THIRD QUESTION, EASTERN REPS HAD ASKED IF IT WERE CORRECT TO CONCLUDE THAT ALL HELICOPTER UNITS IN THE GROUND FORCES IN BELGIUM AND THE NETHERLANDS HAD BEEN COUNTED IN THE FIRST CATEGORY. THE  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00425 14 OF 16 121552Z

ANSWER WAS THAT THE EASTERN UNDERSTANDING WAS CORRECT. AS REGARDS THE EAST'S FOURTH QUESTION, WESTERN REPS HAD TAKEN NOT OF THIS QUESTION.

79. US DEP REP STATED THAT WESTERN REPS WOULD NOW LIKE TO TURN TO DISCUSSION OF DATA, AND AS PART OF PARTICIPANTS CONTINUING EXAMINATION OF THIS SUBJECT, THE WEST HAD SOME FURTHER POINTS TO MAKE REGARDING EASTERN FIGURES. FIRST, WESTERN REPS WOULD LIKE TO CONFIRM THEIR UNDERSTANDING OF THE MILITARY PERSONNEL THAT HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN EASTERN FIGURES FOR EACH EASTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANT.

THAT IS, THESE REMARKS REFERRED TO THE TOTAL STRENGTH OF THE MILITARY MANPOWER OF EACH EASTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANT AS REFLECTED IN FIGURES PRESENTED BY THE EAST. IN REGARD TO LIST A WHICH THE WEST HAD GIVEN TO EASTERN REPS ON JUNE 7 AND JUNE 20, 1978, EASTERN REPS HAD SAID THAT THEY HAD COUNTED ALL THE MILITARY PERSONNEL OF UNITS AND COMMANDS ENUMERATED IN LIST A IN THE DATA ON SOVIET GROUND AND AIR FORCES MANPOWER.

80. US DEP REP SAID THAT WITH REGARD TO LIST B WHICH THE WESTE HAD GIVEN TO EASTERN REPS ON FEBRUARY 15, 1977 AND JUNE 20, 1978, IT WAS THE WESTERN UNDERSTANDING THAT ALL PERSONNEL OF ALL SOVIET UNITS OF THE TYPE LISTED HAD BEN INCLUDED IN THE TOTAL FIGURE WHICH TE EAST HAD PRESENTED FOR SOVIET MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS. IT WAS THE WEST'S UNDERSTANDING THAT THE EAST HAD ALSO INCLUDED IN FIGURES ON SOVIET FORCES ALL MILITARY PERSONNEL OF ALL FORMATIONS, UNITS AND SUBUNITS WHICH WERE CENTRALLY SUBORDINATED OR SUBORDINATE TO THE SOVIET GROUPS OF FORCES IN THE GDR, POLAND AND THE CSSR. WITH REGARD TO THE OTHER EASTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, IT WAS WESTERN REPS'

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00425 14 OF 16 121552Z

UNDERSTANDING THAT THEEAST HAD INCLUDED IN ITS FIGURES

FOR POLISH, GDR, AND CZECHOSLOVAK GROUND AND AIR MANPOWER ALL THE MILITARY PERSONNEL OF ALL UNITS AND COMMANDS OF THE TYPE ENUMERATED ON LIST A, ALL THE MILITARY PERSONNEL OF ALL THE FORMATIONS, UNITS AND SUBUNITS ENUMERATED ON LIST B, REGARDLESS OF SUBORDINATION, AND ALL THE MILITARY PERSONNEL OF ALL FORMATIONS, UNITS AND SUBUNITS SUBORDINATE TO MINISTRIES OF DEFENSE INCLUDING, OF COURSE, THE PERSONNEL OF THE MINISTRIES THEMSELVES. IF THIS WESTERN UNDERSTANDING OF THE PERSONNEL WHOM THE EAST STATED IT HAD INCLUDED IN ITS FIGURES WAS INCORRECT IN ANY RESPECT, WESTERN REPS WOULD ASK THE EAST TO INFORM THEM OF THIS.

81. US DEP REP STATED THAT, SECOND, WITH REGARD TO EXCLUSIONS, IT WAS THE WEST'S UNDERSTANDING THAT THE PERSONNEL ON THE LIST READ BY GDR REP IN THE PRESENT SESSION, WHICH WAS SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME AS THE LIST WHICH HAD BEEN READ BY SOVIET REP ON MAY 31, 1977, HAD BEEN EXCLUDED FROM EASTERN FIGURES FOR ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS.

82. US DEP REP SAID THAT IT WAS THE WEST'S UNDERSTANDING FROM THESE EASTERN STATEMENTS ABOUT EXCLUSIONS AND FROM EASTERN REPLIES TO WESTERN QUESTIONS THAT THE EAST WAS STATING THAT IT HAD NOT EXCLUDED FROM ITS FIGURES ON THE FORCES OF INDIVIDUAL EASTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS ANY PERSONNEL OTHER THAN THOSE ABOVE AND HAD EXCLUDED NO PERSONNEL, ASIDE FROM THOSE JUST LISTED, WHO WERE FULL TIME ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZED TO WEAR A MILITARY UNIFORM, WHO WERE PAID OUT OF MILITARY BUDGETS. IF THIS UNDERSTANDING OF THE EASTERN POSITION WAS INCORRECT IN ANY RESPECT, WESTERN REPS REQUESTED THE EAST TO INFORM THEM OF THIS.

83. TARASOV SAID EASTERN REPS WOULD NOT HAVE ANY DIFFICULTIES IN ANSWERING THESE POINTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00425 15 OF 16 121556Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10  
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05  
SP-02 SS-15 ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /094 W  
-----108807 121558Z /40

P R 121213Z JUL 78  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3086

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE BRUSSELS BEL  
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GER

S E C R E T SECTION 15 OF 16 MBFR VIENNA 0425

LIST A AS WELL AS IN CONNECTION WITH THE LIST OF EXCLUSIONS WHICH THE EAST HAD MADE IN COUNTING THEIR NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THEIR ARMED FORCES. BUT ALL QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO LISTS B AND C WOULD BE CONSIDERED BY THE EAST ONLY IN THE EVENT THAT THE WEST ORGANIZED THOSE LISTS IN CONFORMITY WITH THE CRITERIA FOR THE DIVISION OF THE ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL BETWEEN THE TWO CATEGORIES WHICH EAST AND WEST HAD AGREED UPON DURING THE DISCUSSION OF EXCHANGE OF ADDITIONAL DATA.

84. US DEP REP SAID THAT, AS HE RECALLED HIS REMARKS JUST MADE, HE HAD POINTED OUT THAT WESTERN REPS WERE NOT REFERRING TO THE ISSUE OF THE DIVISION BETWEEN TWO MAJOR CATEGORIES AND HE HAD NOT BEEN REFERRING TO LIST C. LISTS A AND B, REGARDLESS OF THEIR ORIGIN, REPRESENTED THE WESTERN UNDERSTANDING OF EASTERN INCLUSIONS. WESTERN REPS WOULD LIKE EASTERN REPS TO REVIEW LIST B.

85. TARASOV SAID THAT THE EAST COULD NOT ANALYZE LIST B BECAUSE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE EAST'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00425 15 OF 16 121556Z

ALLOCATION OF FORCES INTO TWO CATEGORIES, THE LIST CONTAINED AN INCORRECT DIVISION OF FORCES BETWEEN COMBAT FORCES AND SUPPORT FORCES.

86. US DEPREP SAID THAT, WHEN HE HAD REFERRED TO LIST B AND HAD ASKED THE EAST ABOUT ITS INCLUSIONS ON THE BASIS OF THIS LIST, HE HAD NOT BEEN TALKING ABOUT THE DIVISION BETWEEN CATEGORIES. EASTERN REPS HAD JUST INVITED WESTERN REPS TO BEGIN A DISCUSSION OF INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS. HE WISHED TO POINT OUT THAT WHEN EASTERN REPS PRESENTED THEIR VIEWS ON INCLUSIONS, WESTERN PARTICIPANTS WOULD EXPECT THAT THE EAST WOULD RESPOND TO WESTERN QUESTIONS ON THIS MATTER.

87. TARASOV SAID THAT EASTERN REPS HAD SAID BEFORE THEY WERE READY TO ANSWER QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS OF EASTERN FORCES IN EASTERN FIGURES. THERE WOULD BE NO PARTICULAR DIFFICULTY IN ANSWERING WESTERN QUESTIONS, IRRESPECTIVE OF WHETHER THESE QUESTIONS CONCERNED INDIVIDUAL UNITS OR LISTS OF UNITS. HOWEVER, FOR REASONS WHICH HAD PREVIOUSLY BEEN GIVEN, THE EAST WOULD NOT CONSIDER LIST B OR LIST C UNLESS

THE DIVISION BETWEEN COMBAT AND NON-COMBAT FORCES HAD BEEN  
ELIMINATED.

88. US DEP REP SAID THAT HE HAD IN EFFECT DONE THIS WHEN HE  
HAD SUGGESTED IN THE LAST INFORMAL SESSION THAT THE EAST COULD  
IGNORE THE SUBDIVISIONS IN THE LIST.

89. TARASOV SAID THAT THE LISTS WHICH THE EAST HAD IN ITS  
POSSESSION WERE NEVERTHELESS IN THE FORM WHICH THE WEST HAD  
PRESENTED THEM.

90. US DEP REP SAID THAT WESTERN REPS WOULD SEE WHAT THEY COULD  
DO TO CHANGE THE FORMAT OF THE LISTS. FOR THE TIME BEING,

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00425 15 OF 16 121556Z

NEVERTHELESS, HE WOULD APPRECIATE IT IF EASTERN REPS WOULD CONSIDER  
THE CONTENTS OF THE LISTS.

91. TARASOV SAID THAT, IN THAT CASE, HE WOULD HAVE TO SAY THAT  
THE WEST HAD MADE ENTIRELY INCORRECT CONCLUSIONS BECAUSE EASTERN  
FORCES WERE NOT DIVIDED INTO COMBAT AND COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES.

92. US DEP REP SAID THE WEST WOULD GIVE EAST NEW LISTS  
WITHOUT SUBHEADINGS.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00425 16 OF 16 121601Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10  
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05  
SP-02 SS-15 ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /094 W  
-----108879 121604Z /40

P R 121213Z JUL 78  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3087  
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE BRUSSELS BEL

USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GER

S E C R E T SECTION 16 OF 16 MBFR VIENNA 0425

93. THE SESSION WAS CONCLUDED. WESTERN REPS INFORMED EASTERN REPS THAT THEY WERE GIVING EASTERN REPS ADVANCE NOTICE THAT WEST MIGHT REQUEST AN INFORMAL SESSION ON THE AFTERNOON OF MONDAY, JULY 17 AND POSSIBLY A PLENARY SESSION ON THE MORNING RATHER THAN THE AFTERNNON OF JULY 19 BUT STATED THAT THEY DID NOT WISH TO FIX ANY DATES AT THIS TIME.

94. TARASOV SAID EAST WOULD BE FLEXIBLE ON THE SCHEDULING AND EASTERN REPS REQUESTED AS EARLY NOTICE AS POSSIBLE.

95. FOLLOWING THE SESSION, TARASOV TOLD NETHERLANDS REP AND US DEP REP THAT ALL OF THE UNITS CONTAINED IN LIST B WERE INCLUDED IN THE SOVIET FORCES. THE SOVIETS WOULD BE WILLING TO DISCUSS LIST B WITH THE WEST, BUT THE WEST SHOULD REMOVE THE HEADINGS "COMBAT", "COMBAT SUPPORT" AND "COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT" FROM THE LIST BECAUSE THE EAST WAS APPREHENSIVE THAT THE WEST MIGHT IN THE FUTURE USE THESE SUBHEADINGS AS A DEVICE FOR ASKING FOR FURTHER DISAGGREGATION OF DATA.DEAN

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 jan 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** DISARMAMENT, MEETING PROCEEDINGS, NEGOTIATIONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 12 jul 1978  
**Decaption Date:** 01 jan 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 20 Mar 2014  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1978MBFRV00425  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** D780285-0599  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** MBFR VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1978/newtext/t19780769/aaaacgjs.tel  
**Line Count:** 1919  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Message ID:** 61460477-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 35  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 26 may 2005  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 2036448  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES OF JULY 11, 1978  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO, MBFR  
**To:** STATE DOD  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkgvwkey:** odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/61460477-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Sheryl P. Walter  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
20 Mar 2014  
**Markings:** Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014